

UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE

La Verne, California

USING A CAUSAL-COMPARATIVE EX POST FACTO DESIGN TO EXAMINE
THE EFFECTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES TO VIOLENCE PROJECT ON THE
REDUCTION OF INCIDENTS OF VIOLENCE AND MISCONDUCT ON
INMATES HOUSED AT CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON-SOLANO
IN VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education
in
Organizational Leadership

Kenya Garrett Williams

College of Education and Organizational Leadership
Organizational Leadership Department

August 2012

Copyright © 2012 by Kenya Garrett Williams

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

Using a Causal-Comparative Ex Post Facto Design to Examine the Effects of the Alternatives to Violence Project on the Reduction of Incidents of Violence and Misconduct on Inmates Housed at California State Prison-Solano in Vacaville, California

Kenya Garrett Williams, EdD

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine if inmates who participated in the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) had a reduction in behavioral misconduct based on archival data (Central Files) contained in the Disciplinary file at California State Prison (CSP) Solano. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine if the level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) in AVP programs indicates differences in misconduct reports.

Methodology: This study was a causal-comparative ex post facto design that compared the number of infractions reported in the Central Files of participants in the Alternatives to Violence Project workshops. Data were collected on 195 level II inmates. Data were gathered through information collected from each participant's Central File and attendance statistics retained through the AVP. The AVP files contained names of participants, their CDCR number, educational levels, the date the participant attended the workshop, how many workshops were attended, and ethnicity. All of the data gathered were calculated and categorized. The findings were compared to the literature to ascertain those supported by the literature and identify those not found in the literature. Final findings and arguments derived from the data analysis were presented in a narrative and table format.

Findings: When all of the analyses are considered together, it would appear that the AVP workshops are effective in reducing behavioral misconduct for those who previously had disciplinary infractions during their incarcerations and among the more educated inmates.

Conclusions: The study data did in part support the hypothesis that attending AVP workshops will reduce the amount or frequency of infractions among inmates housed at CSP-Solano. There was a reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct or violent behavior at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who have previously had disciplinary infractions.

Recommendations: Further research is advised. Further research of a more longitudinal nature may be necessary to prove or disprove the effectiveness of reducing behavioral misconduct for all inmates.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLES	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
DEDICATION	xii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Problem Statement	11
The Purpose of the Study	12
Significance of Study	13
Definitions of Terms	14
Delimitations	15
Organization of the Study	15
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
Violence in Society	16
Racism in Prison	18
Type of Violence.....	19
Violence in Prison	21
Cognitive Behavioral Programs	26
Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP).....	31
California State Prison-Solano, Vacaville, California	34

Summary	35
III. METHODOLOGY.....	38
Purpose of the Study	38
Research Questions	39
Hypotheses	39
Research Type and Design.....	39
Population	41
Accessible Population	43
Sampling	44
Instrumentation	46
Data Collection.....	48
Data Analysis	48
Validity.....	50
Limitations	51
Summary	52
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY.....	53
Purpose Statement.....	53
Research Questions	54
Null Hypotheses	54
Methodology	55
Participant Description.....	55
Summary of the Findings.....	67

Findings for the Research Hypotheses	68
Research Hypotheses 1	68
Research Hypotheses 2	69
Research Hypotheses 3	70
Research Hypotheses 4	71
Summary of Results	75
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	77
Summary of the Study	77
The Problem	78
Purpose of the Study	79
Research Questions	79
Methodology	80
Population and Sample	80
Summary of Results: Key Findings and Related Literature	82
Research Question 1	82
Research Question 2	83
Research Question 3	85
Research Question 4	86
Conclusions	87
Conclusion 1	87
Conclusion 2	87
Conclusion 3	88

Conclusion 4	88
Conclusion 5	89
Conclusion 6	89
Implications for Actions.....	89
Recommendations for Further Research.....	90
Concluding Remarks.....	92
Researcher's Lessons From This Study	93
REFERENCES	95
APPENDICES	105
A. AVP DATA WORKSHEET	106
B. IRB REQUEST AND APPROVAL LETTERS	108
C. ALTERNATIVES TO VIOLENCE PROJECT (AVP) AUTHORIZATION FOR PROGRAM NAME USAGE	111

TABLES

Table	Page
1. AVP Participant Demographics by Race	56
2. AVP Participant Demographics by Age	57
3. AVP Participant Demographics by Incarcerated Offense	57
4. AVP Participant Demographics Length of Incarceration	58
5. AVP Participant Demographics by Education Experience.....	59
6. AVP Participant Demographics by TABE Levels.....	59
7. AVP Participant’s CSRA Scores	60
8. Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: Ethnicity	61
9. Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: Age	62
10. Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: Education	63
11. Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: TABE Score	64
12. Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: CSRA ...	65
13. Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: Types of Workshops Attended	65
14. Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP BASIC Among Those Who Had Infractions Prior to the Workshop	66
15. Paired Samples Statistics—Pair 1	68
16. Paired Samples Test—Pair 1	68
17. Paired Samples Statistics—Workshops	69

18. Paired Samples Test ^a —Workshops	70
19. Paired Samples Statistics—Among Those With Prior Infractions	70
20. Paired Samples Test—Among Those With Prior Infractions	71
21. Paired Samples Statistics—Race	72
22. Paired Samples Test—Race	72
23. Paired Samples Statistics—Age.....	73
24. Paired Samples Test ^a —Age	73
25. Paired Samples Statistics—Education	74
26. Paired Samples Test—Education.....	74

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Keith Larick for his kindness and support; you believed in me and I will never forget that.

To Dr. Colleen Patten, my friend, you motivated me, pushed me, and at times guided me . . . thank you.

To my AVP family thank you for welcoming me with open arms, a warm heart, and to Pat and Joann, a warm bed.

Lastly, I want to thank Pam Ditto, you were my cheerleader, a shoulder to cry on, and a beacon in the deepest darkest night. I love you, and know your motivation, laughter, and the joy you exhume are like a balm to my soul . . . Thank You.

DEDICATION

I give thanks first and foremost to God almighty, and thank him for blessing me with a mother who instilled the thirst for knowledge in her children.

To my mother, a single mother, impoverished; who raised four children, three of whom are doctors, . . . You are extraordinary. I hope we continue to make you proud. It is my mother, Beatrice Garrett's wisdom, love, and passion that runs through my veins and is the catalyst that keeps me going.

To my husband, Ike, "I love you"; you have been a constant in my life, Thank you.

To my sisters Drs. Crystal Garrett and Omar Garrett Wray, Mom would be so proud to know that you two have been here supporting me and at times carrying me through this journey. . . . Thank you.

To my brother Shawn, I know you are watching me, I hope I am making you smile.

For my children . . . finish what you start, know how to dream, and believe in yourselves enough to go after that dream with everything you have.

Lastly but by no means least . . . Queen Pauline, thank you for your words of wisdom and your scriptures of prayer. You ministered to my heart.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

War is devastating; it can affect a country physically, emotionally, and financially. As of April 2011, more than 1.6 million American troops have been deployed in the Iraq and Afghanistan operations. More than 4,000 have been killed. Another 65,000 have been wounded or injured, or have contracted a disease. Of the 750,000 troops who have been discharged so far, some 260,000 have been treated at veterans' medical facilities (Stiglitz & Bilmes, 2008a).

Nearly 100,000 troops have been diagnosed as possessing mental health conditions. Another 200,000 have sought counseling and re-adjustment services at walk-in veterans' centers. To date, the total cost of war that has been allocated by Congress is \$1.26 trillion with \$815 billion to Iraq and \$445.1 billion to Afghanistan. These figures do not account for the wars being deficit financed. Nor do these figures consider that taxpayers will need to make additional interest payments on the national debt because of these deficits, according to the Congressional Research Service's latest report, which has access to Department of Defense financial reports (Stiglitz & Bilmes, 2008a). The World Health Organization reported,

Many more people die from homicide than from attack in a war, and even more die from suicide. In fact, for every death due to war, there are three deaths due to homicide and five deaths due to suicide. However, most violence happens to

people behind closed doors and results not in death, but often in years of physical and emotional suffering. (Harvey, 2011, Fact #2)

Schools reported that, during the 1992-2009 period, 313 homicides occurred during school. Also during this time, an additional 103 serious violent crimes were documented by school officials (Almond, 2008). Violence in the community, home, school, and in the workplace are major concerns in today's society. The Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that the United States in 2009 documented serious violent crimes at a staggering 903,300 incidents in one year (Sabol & West, 2010). California contributed to 174,459 of these reports representing 19.37% of the reported violence for 2009.

The U.S. Department of Justice, in conjunction with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, reported in 2009 that an estimated 1,318,398 violent crimes occurred nationwide. This translates to an estimated 429.4 violent crimes per 100,000 inhabitants. The data collected also revealed that aggravated assaults accounted for the highest number of violent crimes reported in law enforcement at 61.2%, robbery 31.0%, forcible rape 6.7%, and murder at 1.2% of estimated violent crimes in 2009 (U.S. Department of Justice, 2010).

Background of the Study

Researchers have found that there is a direct relationship between victims of child abuse and violent behaviors leading to arrest. Widom (1989) compared 908 persons with substantiated cases of child abuse or neglect between 1967 and 1971 and a matched control sample of 667 respondents and found that those who had been abused or

neglected were significantly more likely than control respondents to have arrests for delinquency, adult crimes, and adult violent crimes. A 6-year follow-up report revealed that by age 32, more than 50% of the abused and neglected sample had been arrested (Maxfield & Widom, 1996). According to Widom and Maxfield (2001), “Being abused or neglected as a child increased the likelihood of arrest as a juvenile by 59 percent, as an adult by 28 percent, and for a violent crime by 30 percent” (p. 2).

Violence in school is an emergent concern. In a 2009 nationally representative sample of youths in Grades 9-12, 11.1% reported being in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months preceding the survey (Parks, 2008). Of male students, 15.2% and of female students 6.7% reported being in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months preceding the survey (Parks, 2008). Five percent did not go to school on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to or from school (Parks, 2008). Of the students, 5.6% reported carrying a weapon (gun, knife, or club) on school property on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey; and 7.7% reported being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property one or more times in the 12 months preceding the survey (Parks, 2008). As criminalgenic behaviors continue, arrests are made and criminals convicted. These youth end up in state prisons by way of the juvenile justice system.

The U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2010) defined violence as “rape, sexual assault, personal robbery or assault” (para. 7). This category includes both attempted and completed crimes. It does not include purse snatching and pocket picking. Murder is not measured by the National Crimes Victim Survey because

of an inability to question the victim. Completed violence is the sum of all completed rapes, sexual assaults, robberies, and assaults, and attempted/threatened violence. The unsuccessful attempt of rape, sexual assault, personal robbery, or assault includes attempted attacks or sexual assaults by means of verbal threats (U.S. Department of Justice, 2010).

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1,524,513 people were incarcerated in the United States by the end of 2009 (Sabol & West, 2010). The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR, 2010), *Year at a Glance Report*, recorded 297,406 men and women in their institution population. The institution population included 155,641 in institutions and camps, 4,961 in community correctional centers, 264 housed in department of mental health state hospitals, and 7,964 in out-of state institutions (U.S. Department of Justice, 2010).

Other population incorporated in the reported count included 15,742 civil addicts who absconded from parole supervision, 1,941 felons temporarily released to other jurisdictions, and 208 inmates in escape status. Currently, there are 145,305 inmates housed in 33 state prisons throughout California, of this total, 10,336 are female offenders; 39.3% are Hispanic, 29.0% Black, 25.6% White, and 6.1% other (U.S. Department of Justice, 2010).

Of inmates, 56.9% were incarcerated due to acts of violence. This percentage represents approximately 96,000 inmates serving time because of violent acts. Of the 17,050 male parole violators returning to custody, 19% returned because of violent crimes they committed. Prisoners in general are more likely to be serving sentences for

violent offenses than in the past. Violent offenders constitute a majority of prisoners (CDCR, 2010). Unless the increase of violence in these areas is addressed, the influence on society will be as devastating as combat and just as costly to our local governments as war.

Violence within correctional facilities is a common occurrence. Correctional violence includes assault and battery, rape, riots, and arson against inmates, staff, and the community. In August 2009, a riot broke out in California State Prison, Chino. The Chino riot raged for 11 hours, and 175 inmates were injured. Men suffered vicious stab and head wounds as prisoners attacked each other with makeshift weapons, including shards of glass and broken water pipes (Nolan, 2009).

Fifty-five inmates were rushed to local hospitals. When officers finally regained control, many inmates had been permanently maimed. Because of the riot, all prisons in Southern California were put on *lockdown* pending the Chino riot investigation (Nolan, 2009). The Chino riot is one indication of the need to reduce violence among California's incarcerated population.

When a correctional institution experiences incidents of violence, daily programming is modified in the institution where the violence occurs. Inmates are affected physically. All movement is suspended and inmates are confined to their cells. This practice is called a lockdown.

Violence among inmates can result in a full lockdown of the prison, thus forcing staff to adjust feeding, education, and medical schedules. The institution is affected financially as riots and lockdowns are direct drivers of overtime among custody staff.

The focus of a 2007 empirical study by the University of Irvine was on the impact of violence in a prison setting. Jenness, Maxson, Matsuda, and Sumner (2007) commented,

Institutional violence continues to be one of the most significant challenges facing corrections administrators and staff. It poses threats to maintaining order in correctional facilities, ensuring the safety of correctional personnel and inmates, effectively designing and delivering programming that enhances inmates' ability to survive in corrections facilities and prosper one released from such facilities, and otherwise implementing corrections in a way that benefits inmates, correctional personnel, and the citizenry. In short, prison violence is a significant social, administrative, and public safety issue. (p. 7)

California state prisons recently have experienced a significant increase in violence. For 2006, CDCR reported 14,490 inmate incidents of violence in the CDCR's institutions and camps (CDCR, 2007). The effect of these occurrences has caused an additional strain on California's current budget deficit. The prison system in California is made up of 168,000 incarcerated individuals representing 4% of California's population. California's state prisons make up 10% of the annual state budget (CDCR, 2010).

Recent increases of incidents of violence, fighting, staff assaults, and general discord among the inmates housed in 33 CDCR's prisons have caused the current budget to spiral into a deficit that has reached \$11 billion (CDCR, 2010). The multi-billion-dollar deficit is projected to continue as the incidents of violence among the prisoners increases across the state. The daily maintenance and upkeep of the prison population adds a significant burden to the California budget crisis.

In a 2006 report generated by CDCR's Offender Information Services data collection unit, it was reported that during the years 1997-2006, assault/battery incidents accounted for 9,090 (63%) of the incidents in 2006 (CDCR, 2007). Those with weapons accounted for 1,869 (13%) and those without weapons 7,221 (50%). Assault/battery

incidents increased from 8,227 in 2005 to 9,090 in 2006. Those without weapons accounted for most of the increase (CDCR, 2007). A report generated by the Grand Jury in California stated,

Consider that in 1977 there were less than twenty thousand prisoners locked up in California. Today, in 33 crowded prisons designed to hold 90,000 inmates there are almost 165,000 prisoners. At a cost conservatively placed by the Department of Corrections at \$129 per day for each prisoner, this kind of warehousing is an expensive recipe for violence and hopelessness that cannot be economically sustained. (Hughes, 2011, p. 1)

Violent behaviors continue throughout the state in all 33 state prisons. During a span of 11 months, January 2008 through November 2008, Avenal State Prison reported 22 battery on staff incidents, 33 battery on inmates, 12 incidents of riots or melees, and 28 different occasions for mutual combat. There were 18 assaults with weapons and 15 assaults that did not include weapons. This is 128 events of violence in an 11-month period at just one of 33 correctional institutions throughout California (CDCR, 2007).

The statistics reported for Avenal State Prison is not the exception to the rule. If the number of incidents at Avenal in a span of 11 months was multiplied by 33, one for each state prison, the incidents of violence would be staggering. The reported total becomes 4,224 incidents of violence or 384 incidents per month per institution. The prisons in the state of California experience an astounding amount of violence during a typical day. Not only do these incidents cause injury and can be fatal to those involved, but they also create a very dangerous work environment for the staff employed at these institutions (CDCR, 2011).

Until the occurrences of violence, staff assaults, institutional lockdowns, and fighting among those incarcerated are reduced in state prisons, California will continue to

incur the cost of providing a safe environment for those prisoners being housed as well as for the staff working at the institutions. Strategies to reduce violence in prisons are needed to offset the budgetary burden of violence and create a safer working environment for those employed by the CDCR. A decrease in violence, fights, and riots can lower the daily operating cost of the prison and relieve the already astronomical deficit burdening the state.

In 2007, 171,444 people were behind bars in California, representing a 2.3% drop over the previous year. California spent \$8.795 billion in fiscal year 2007 on corrections. For every dollar spent on higher education, California spent 83 cents on corrections (Warren, 2008).

The problems in California's prisons have been the focus of many debates. Recent lawsuits have caused California's prison system to fall into the hands of an oversight review board. Inadequate health care, overcrowding, racism, and gangs are just a few of the obstacles CDCR faces.

In such an environment, violence is prevalent. Inmate violence over the past 3 years resulted in over \$8 million in workers' compensation and healthcare costs for injuries to prison staff, and the high-security confinement of prisoners involved in violence costs the state over \$400 million per year. More so, people incarcerated under these brutalizing conditions frequently return to society unprepared and angry, and the violence continues. More than a half million California children have an incarcerated parent, and this problem affects them, their families, and the wider community (AVP International, 1999).

A strategy used in correctional facilities to curb violent crimes is cognitive behavior treatment, cell dog programs, thinking for change, and parenting classes. Cognitive behavior programs are essential for reducing the level of violence by teaching inmates ways of resolving conflicts that do not result in violence in a given situation. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) uses two basic approaches in bringing about change: (a) restructuring of cognitive events and (b) social and interpersonal skills training. The two approaches are built on two pathways of reinforcement: (a) strengthening the thoughts that lead to positive behaviors and (b) strengthening behavior because of the positive consequence of that behavior. The former has its roots in cognitive therapy, the latter in behavioral therapy. Together, they form the essential platform of CBT (Milkman & Wanberg, 2007). According to Milkman and Wanberg (2005),

Cognitive and behavioral changes have a reinforcing effect. When cognitive change leads an individual to change his or her actions and behavior, it results in a positive outcome that strengthens the change in the individual's thought patterns. When this occurs, changes in thinking are reinforced by the changes in behavior, which further strengthens those behavioral changes. (p. 207)

To reduce violence in prisons, some state prisons have instituted behavior modification programs. Behavior modification programs teach coping skills and change unwanted behaviors. Behavior modification is defined as the direct changing of unwanted behavior by means of biofeedback or conditioning ("Behavior Modification," 2011).

The Alternative to Violence Project (AVP) is a program that focuses on reducing violence among the prison population. This behavior modification program's only

purpose is to concentrate on reducing behaviors that lead to violence. Through a series of workshops, incarcerated individuals are provided with the skills and training needed to avoid incidents of violence (AVP International, 1999).

In 1975, AVP was established when a group of inmates in Green Haven Prison, New York, wanted to help at-risk youth. In collaboration with the Quaker Project of Community Conflict, they developed the first prison-community program to combat the cycle of violence. Due to the success of the program, AVP expanded to include adult offenders, and it has been implemented in prisons all over the United States and in several other countries, such as New Zealand, Costa Rica, Israel, Russia, and South Africa (AVP International, 1999).

Alternative to Violence Project workshops are cofacilitated by inmates and noninmates. Workshops are arranged, administered, and conducted by AVP groups under the direction of AVP/USA. Though the CDCR works closely with AVP, the AVP program is independent and not under the control of the Department of Corrections in any state. Like the prison workshop facilitators, incarcerated participants are volunteers (AVP International, 1999).

In other words, inmates are never mandated to attend the workshops, and they receive no benefit other than the inherent benefits of workshop participation. Participants at these workshops are offered basic, advanced, and training for trainers' workshops. The outside volunteers are nonstate employees who cofacilitate three 8-hour workshops with inmates seeking to change their harmful behaviors. The goal of this program is to assist

inmates in choosing behaviors that will not lead to violence but to conflict resolution (AVP International, 1999).

The levels of violence experienced in California's state prisons are clear indicators of the need to develop, establish, and implement behavior modification programs. There is an obvious need for the prisons to activate programs that enforce nonviolent behaviors among incarcerated populations. CDCR staff are provided with pepper spray and other nonlethal tools to control outbreaks of violence. What is needed is for the inmates to arm themselves with *tools*, tools to help them choose nonviolent behaviors.

Providing behavior modification programs for the inmates housed throughout California can reduce the amount of violent occurrences, allow inmates to be housed in secure surroundings, and create a safer workplace for the staff the prison employs. It is especially important at this time that efforts be made to reduce violence in correctional facilities and give those who are incarcerated the skills to curtail violence. Due to the economic crisis, more inmates are either being released from correctional facilities or housed in facilities that are more crowded. Without programs that support the development of new skills and methods of resolving conflict, there is greater risk of violence within the correctional system and in communities, as individuals are released.

Problem Statement

On March 20, 2009, California State Prison, Solano (CSP-Solano) implemented the AVP program and organized the first basic AVP workshop. Since March 2009, CSP-Solano has graduated 397 participants of the basic AVP, 137 from the advanced, and 27

from the training for trainers. There have been 27 workshops. CSP-Solano currently has 25 inmate facilitators who have participated in all three levels of the workshop as well as cofacilitated workshops as part of the training process. There is a waiting list of more than 300 men waiting to take the AVP classes (AVP International, 1999).

What is needed are programs that can provide inmates participating in behavior modification workshops with the skills needed to navigate through the penal system in a nonviolent manner. The intent is that by completing the AVP workshops, those participating will be provided with coping skills they can use when they are released from custody. Today, 18 prisons have implemented the AVP program. Though research has been completed on the efficacy of the AVP program, all studies were plagued with serious design and statistical flaws, making findings inconclusive. More and better research needs to be conducted to determine the true value, meaningfulness, and efficacy of AVP programs with adult offender populations (Cordon & Segovia, 2008).

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if inmates who participated in the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) had a reduction in behavioral misconduct based on archival data (Central Files) contained in the Disciplinary file at California State Prison (CSP) Solano. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine if the level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) in AVP programs indicates differences in misconduct reports.

The following research questions were developed for this study:

1. What are the effects (reduced incidents of violent behavior) of the AVP program on inmates housed at CSP-Solano based on archival data recorded in Central Files?
2. Does the level of participation in the AVP program (Basic, Advance, and T4T), make a difference in the effects (reduced incidents of behavioral misconduct or violent behavior) as recorded in archival data in Central Files at CSP-Solano?
3. Is there a reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct (violent behavior) at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who have previously had disciplinary infractions?
4. Is there a difference in reduction of behavioral misconduct for inmates based on demographic factors of race, age, and education?

Significance of Study

In addressing the need for behavior modification programs in CSP-Solano, the data were gathered from incarcerated participants, Department of Corrections' employees, and outside facilitators. The review of literature provides information needed to promote programs that teach positive behaviors among prisoners. Furthermore, the reduction of violence in inmates will benefit staff employed by the CDCR by creating a safer environment, the community by releasing parolees who have learned conflict resolution skills, and the state of California by reducing the number of violent incidents that historically have affected the fiscal budget. Finally, the results of the study may prove to be useful to advisors, consultants, and outside organizations that work with the Department of Corrections.

Definitions of Terms

AA/NA. An international mutual aid movement declaring, “The primary purpose is to stay sober and help other alcoholics and Narcotic dependent individuals achieve sobriety” (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2012, para. 1).

Anger management. Commonly refers to a system of psychological therapeutic techniques and exercises by which someone with excessive or uncontrollable anger can control or reduce the triggers, degrees, and effects of an angered emotional state. In some countries, courses in anger management may be mandated by their legal system.

Behavior modification. Behavior modification is a treatment approach, based on the principles of operant conditioning that replaces undesirable behaviors with more desirable ones, through positive or negative reinforcement.

Cell-dog program. A community service program that allows inmates to volunteer as pet handlers to socialize dogs for the visually, hearing impaired, and physically challenged. Dogs from the humane society are also socialized for family adoptions.

Cognitive behavior. A type of treatment that helps patients understand the thoughts and feelings that influence behaviors.

Incarceration. Confinement in a jail or prison.

Lockdown. A course of action to control the movement of inmates.

Violence.

Violence is the use of physical force to injure people or property. Violence may cause physical pain to those who experience it directly as well as emotional distress to those who either experience or witness it. Individuals, families,

schools, workplaces, communities, society, and the environment all are harmed by violence. ("Violence," 2012, para. 1)

Delimitations

The study is delimited to inmates housed at CSP-Solano during 2009-2010.

Study participants do not include inmates housed at other state facilities, parolees, or state employees. No attempt was made to gather information from other sources, including staff, inmates released from custody, inmates housed in other states who may have participated in AVP, custody staff, or other state workers employed by the Department of Corrections. This study does not include data before 2009 or after 2010.

Organization of the Study

This study was presented in five chapters, followed by appendices and references. Chapter I introduced the problem statement, purpose statement, research questions, delimitations, significance of the study, and definitions of terms, and concluded with an overview of the dissertation. Chapter II contains an analysis of the relevant literature on the beginning principles and the transition to literature. Chapter III describes the research design, methodology, data collection instrument and procedures, and population and sample of the study. An analysis of the data and a discussion of the findings are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V summarizes the study, offers conclusions, makes recommendations, and outlines implications for the study. Appendices are found at the conclusion of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The dynamics of violence among incarcerated populations and the factors that contribute to or meliorate violence in prisons were explored in this review of the literature. The literature review investigates the background of violence in society, the causes of violence, violence in prisons, and cognitive behavior programs utilized to improve the behavior and social ability of inmates. The literature review also provides an in-depth view of behavior modification programs and their potential for improving prison environments.

Violence in Society

In 2008, more than one in every 100 adults in the United States was confined in local jails and state or federal correctional facilities (Warren, 2008). Evidence is steadily accumulating that prolonged exposure to violent television (TV) programming during childhood is associated with subsequent aggression. Anderson and Bushman (2002) discussed new work (Johnson et al.) that, from their perspective, clearly demonstrated this association in adolescents and young adults, thus broadening the range of individuals affected by media violence (see also Bushman & Anderson, 2002).

The National Television Violence Study has been the largest content analysis undertaken to date. It analyzed programming over three consecutive TV seasons from

1994 to 1997. Among the findings are the following, which create a strong argument that television is one of the catalysts fueling violence in society today:

- Nearly 2 out of 3 TV programs contained some violence, averaging about 6 violent acts per hour.
- Fewer than 5% of these programs featured an anti-violence theme or pro-social message emphasizing alternatives to or consequences of violence.
- Violence was found to be more prevalent in children's programming (69%) than in other types of programming (57%). In a typical hour of programming, children's shows featured more than twice as many violent incidents than other types of programming.
- The average child who watches 2 hours of cartoons a day may see nearly 10,000 violent incidents each year, of which the researchers estimate that at least 500 pose a high risk for learning and imitating aggression and becoming desensitized to violence.
- The number of prime-time programs with violence increased over the three years of the study, from 53% to 67% on broadcast television and from 54% to 64% on basic cable. Premium cable networks have the highest percentage of shows with violence, averaging 92% since 1994. (The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, 2003, p. 1)

Vaknin (2007) discussed many reasons why violence occurs:

Violence in the family often follows other forms of more subtle and long-term abuse: verbal, emotional, psychological, sexual, or financial. Violence is closely correlated with alcoholism, drug consumption, intimate-partner homicide, teen pregnancy, infant and child mortality, spontaneous abortion, reckless behaviors, suicide, and the onset of mental health disorders. Most abusers and batterers are males, but a significant minority are women. This being a "Women's Issue," the problem was swept under the carpet for generations and only recently has it come to public awareness. Yet, even today, society—for instance, through the court and the mental health systems—largely ignores domestic violence and abuse in the family. This induces feelings of shame and guilt in the victims and "legitimizes" the role of the abuser. Violence in the family is mostly spousal—one spouse beating, raping, or otherwise physically harming and torturing the other. But children are also and often victims—either directly, or indirectly. Other vulnerable familial groups include the elderly and the disabled. Abuse and violence cross geographical and cultural boundaries and social and economic strata. It is common among the rich and the poor, the well-educated and the less so, the young and the middle-aged, city dwellers and rural folk. It is a universal phenomenon. (n.p.)

Racism in Prison

In her article, “Judge Finds Bias Against Minority Inmates,” Tabor (1991) discussed the Elmira discrimination. U.S. District Court Judge David Larimer, in a ruling issued Tuesday in Rochester, said the discrimination “goes beyond verbal taunts and racial slurs” and violates the inmates’ constitutional rights. Larimer stated, “The persistent nature of this conduct is such that it violates the equal protection clause and that it must cease” (as cited in Tabor, 1991, n.p.).

Larimer’s ruling came in a class-action lawsuit filed in 1986 against three prison officials on behalf of Black and Hispanic inmates by the Prisoners’ Rights Project of the New York City Legal Aid Society. Larimer gave the two sides 30 days to discuss how to stop the racism. James Flateau said that many of the actions cited in Larimer’s ruling were made at the guard level, meaning that the decisions made were made by correctional officers and not necessary sanctioned by administration.

Lahm (2001) examined two theories, the first was importation, which is the belief that inmates bring violent tendencies and behaviors with them into prison. The second theory is deprivation theory. Lahm believed there is a correlation between the prison environment and violent behaviors among inmates. In Lahm’s study, data were collected from inmates incarcerated in three state prisons located in Kentucky, Ohio, and Tennessee. These data explored a scarcely researched area of prison inter-workings and the causes of violence within the prison system. This study determined that the theory of micro-level deprivation did not influence or deter an inmate from behaving violently. Finally, Lahm’s dissertation validated the importance of accessibility to several different

types of data. The information collected for the purposes of this study was a self-report data collection from inmates housed in one of the three prisons.

A Question of Freedom is a memoir that examines the journey of an African American man sentenced to 9 years in state prison at the age of 16 (Betts, 2009). Betts has painted a vivid picture as he navigates through the perplex and often confusing juvenile justice and correctional system. Although sentenced when he was 16, Betts participated in a carjacking in the state of Virginia and thus was sentenced as an adult. Betts was born into a middle class family; *A Question of Freedom* documents his journey from juvenile facilities to his stay in some of the worst prisons in the state of Virginia. The prison system through which Betts navigates is an organization that historically separates its population by race, levels of violence, and internal caste systems.

Betts lamented over his loss of freedom, loss of time, and the juvenile justice system as a whole. Reformation for Betts was found through literacy, education, and a new-found love for books. This book paints a vivid and realistic picture of the juvenile justice system in this country. It also offers hope for the incarcerated through self-help programs, education, and the ability to increase literacy.

Types of Violence

During the period of 2008-09, the National Inmate Survey described sexual victimization in U.S. prisons and among inmates. Two findings were highlighted in this report:

1. An estimated 4.4% of prisoners and 3.1% of jail inmates reported experiencing one or more incidents of sexual victimization by another inmate or facility staff in the past 12 months or since admission to the facility, if less than 12 months.

Nationwide, these percentages suggest that approximately 88,500 adult prisoners at the time of the survey had been sexually victimized.

2. About 2.1% of prison inmates and 1.5% of jail inmates reported an incident involving another inmate. Additionally, an estimated 1.0% of prison inmates and 0.8% of jail inmates said they had nonconsensual sex with another inmate (the most serious type of acts), including unwilling manual stimulation and oral, anal, or vaginal penetration. (Mazza, 2012, p. 11)

While this report was astounding and created statistical data, data that were used to pass the PREA (Prison Rape Elimination Act) among California State prisons, it offered no assistance or resources for the perpetrators. Nor did this report offer treatment or resolution for the victims.

In *The Social Injustice of Prison Rape: A Historical Analysis* Jenko (2010) emphasized that prison rape is a serious threat for countless prisoners. The purpose of her study was to examine the causes of rape in prison and why it has been an unobstructed form of inequality in American culture. Furthermore, Jenko revealed that society has a retributive attitude toward sexual assault in prison and reviewed legislation that was enacted to help minimize the social injustice of rape in all detention facilities. This historical analysis revealed that sexual assault occurs in every type of correctional facility; thus, prison sexual violence profoundly impacts survivors, threatens public health, and hinders the ability of facility personnel to maintain orderly, safe, and productive correctional environments. Typically, research on sexual assault in prison is scarce and inadequate due to small sample sizes and low participant response rates (Jenko, 2010). Studies on inmate victimization have produced contradictory conclusions, making it difficult to accurately evaluate the prevalence of sexual violence in correctional

institutions. This study did not address the need for adequate solutions to the ongoing issue of rape in the U.S. prison system.

Prison Rape: A Description of the Problem by Samuel Banuelos (2008) reviewed the problem of prison rape in the United States and examined some of the major factors that contribute to rape in prison. His study highlighted efforts that are currently being implemented to address the problem. Banuelos's review of the literature demonstrated that there is not sufficient research on this subject to quantify the extent of rape that occurs in U.S. jails and prisons. Furthermore, based on the evidence found on prison rape, there is a significant stigma attached to this behavior that has hampered researchers in their efforts to gather information from victims of prison rape. Thus, research on the topic needs further exploration due to inclusive studies on the topic.

Violence in Prison

There is a direct relationship between violence in prison and prisoners with a prior history of violence. In other words, prisoners who enter the system through acts of violence are more likely to continue their violent behavior in prison than prisoners with no prior history of violence (Toch, Adams, & Grant, 1989). In "Myths and Realities of Prison Violence: A Review of the Evidence," Byrne and Hummer (2007) examined how disorders, drug abuse, and gang activity are linked to violence in correctional facilities. According to Byrne and Hummer, there is an increase in minorities, violent offenders, life-threatening diseases, and mentally ill offenders in prison; however, the rate of violence in federal and state prisons has declined despite the doubling of the prison population. The authors argue that the key to reducing prison violence and disorder is to

uncover the appropriate tipping point between formal and informal social control and mechanisms. The study concluded that three strategies are necessary to reduce violence in prison: (a) demand transparency, (b) require evidence-based practice, and (c) implement innovative measures of prison performance and quality.

Byrne and Hummer (2007) explained what they meant by the term *demand transparency*. They believed that transparency breeds accountability in that there needs to be an external review system in place to inform the public about the effects of prison violence on an offender released from prison. Prisoners who have experienced institutional violence are more likely to commit violent crimes when released. Therefore, holding the prison accountable for violence in prison can lead to more prisons instituting behavior modification programs to help reduce violent crime in prison.

By *require evidence-based practice*, Byrne and Hummer (2007) believed that there needs to be a national violence reduction program that (a) conducts reviews of specific prison problem, and (b) field-tests strategies designed based on the reviews, and evaluates these strategies using experiments and quasi-experiments in their evaluation design.

By *implement innovative measures of prison performance and quality*, Byrne and Hummer (2007) emphasized the use of nontraditional evaluation of violence and disorder to recognizing the importance of changing the culture of prisons (inmate, staff, and management culture) and improving the quality of life for both inmates and staff.

Although their study revealed a snapshot of violence in prison and it outlined strategies to reduce violence in communities committed by offenders released from

prison, it failed to address the need for prison modification programs instituted to reduce violent behavior in prisoners (Byrne & Hummer, 2007).

In “Self-View and Violence in Prison Literature Review,” Bryan (2002) examined the correlation between high self-esteem and violence in incarcerated individuals. One of the theories the author discussed was the impact high self-esteem versus low self-esteem plays in one’s decision to participate in violent behaviors. This literature review indicated a need to closer examine the theory that there is a correlation between narcissism and self-esteem (Bryan, 2002). Although the author was thorough in her investigation of the literature available on violence in the prison, there were some clear gaps in the literature regarding anger management programs, efficacy programs and the relationship between reduction in violence and prison environment.

In *The Discovery of Violent Women in Prison: A Descriptive Analysis of Violent incidents in the Canadian Federal Correctional System*, Bell (2004) stated that there are very few studies on violence in federal prisons for women despite increasing numbers of women entering prison. Bell (2004) provided a descriptive and exploratory analysis of violence in Canadian federal prisons for women offenders. She examined the nature and extent of violent incidents, the characteristics of violent perpetrators, and the individual and environmental factors for violence in prison. Additionally, the researcher identified three theoretical perspectives, which include feminist theory, prison adjustment theories, and the theory of sex.

The methodology for this research utilizes both a quantitative and a qualitative research design. The quantitative research explored the occurrence of violent incidents

among women offenders, while the qualitative method conducted interviews of five women offenders in three federal prisons in Canada to examine their perceptions of violence and their behaviors. The study described the environment and the number of incidents of violence in Canadian federal prisons.

In *Race Matters: Black Rage in the American Political System*, Noble (2003) examined a proposed theory of Black rage in the American prison system by including inmate narratives from earlier studies by Carroll and Robinson, who demonstrated the rage and frustration of Black males. These prison victimization studies found that Black males were overrepresented among the aggressors in prison assaults, and White males were overrepresented as victims. Noble's findings suggested that Black rage against White America was a determinate in understanding the interracial dynamics in prison assaults. Although the theory was examined in the context of prison violence, the processes and variables described offer significant insight in explaining other interracial patterns observed in crime and violence statistics.

Economists developed the TOBIT model to analyze data with censored or truncated values on the dependent variable. Noble (2003) utilized cross-sectional models and longitudinal change score regression models to test the core assumptions of the Black rage theory, and the implementation of institution-level data from the 1984, 1990, and 1995 versions of the Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities was utilized. Both the cross-sectional and longitudinal findings revealed strong support for the theory of Black rage among correctional facilities located in the Midwest region. Thus, there was a strong positive relationship between the percentage of Black male

inmates and the staff assault rate. Similarly, in the Midwest there was a negative correlation between the percentage of Black staff and the staff assault rate. While the research examined Black rage in the American prison system, it lacked discussion on the modification of rage in prison (Noble, 2003).

Komarovskaya's (2009) dissertation, *Trauma, PTSD and the cycle of Violence Among Incarcerated Men and Women*, examined the effects of trauma among incarcerated men and women. This study examined the effects of post traumatic stress disorders' (PTSD) effects preincarceration and postincarceration. Komarovskaya explored whether the PTSD aided the behavior that caused the incarceration or whether the incarceration caused the PTSD.

Surveys were used to gather data from individuals who participated in Komarovskaya's (2009) research. There were three objectives in this study: (a) describe the demographic and criminal characteristics of incarcerated men and women, (b) assess gender differences in the traumatic exposure, and (c) evaluate the relationship between traumatic exposure to a variety of dependents variables.

Komarovskaya concluded that trauma has profound effects on adjustment and overall well-being. Early exposure to trauma has more devastating effects on subsequent adjustment than later exposure (Komarovskaya, 2009).

Rocheleau (2011), in *Prisoners' Coping Skills And Involvement in Serious Prison Misconduct and Violence*, examined whether prisoners' ways of coping affect their involvement in prison violence and misconduct; she also examined the traditional predictors of serious misconduct and violence in prison. Quantitative and qualitative

methods were used as a method of data collection. Quantitative methods included surveys administered to a random sample of 312 prisoners involved in serious misconduct in medium and maximum security prisons; information was obtained from the prison's database. The qualitative research included in-depth interviews with prison staff and prisoners as well as from observations of disciplinary hearings. The findings of the study revealed the following: First, five out of eight methods of coping were related to either violence or misconduct. Prisoners were less likely to be disruptive if they elicited support from their loved ones, staff, or fellow prosocial prisoners. Second, trait emotions did have an effect on misconduct as coping mechanisms were utilized; angry prisoners were less likely to be involved in misconduct, while anxious prisoners were more likely to be involved in misconduct. Third, the research revealed that five categories of prisoners, such as prisoners with mental health problems, young prisoners, weak prisoners, gang members, and well behaved prisoners who were victimized, were more inclined to be involved in misconduct. Finally, the study illuminated that policies, practices, and the skill levels of staff affected the violence and misconduct in prison. The research analyzed prison misconduct and coping strategies.

Cognitive Behavioral Programs

Researchers recognized that cognitive behavioral treatment programs have become an integral part of assisting inmates in behavioral modifications. With the implementation of cognitive behavioral treatment programs, criminal offenders are confronted with and can learn to change their unwanted behavior with the intention of becoming a law abiding citizen.

Cognitive therapists believe people develop their personality from the values they inherited from their environment. Behavioral therapists focus on behavior modification as well as history similar to cognitive therapy. The departments of corrections administrators often seek low-cost, effective treatment intervention to assist in reducing recidivism and stopping the revolving door phenomenon present in the United States criminal justice system (Hansen, 2008).

California spends an enormous amount of money rehabilitating inmates in order to stabilize them in and outside of prison. Ten percent of California's state budget is allocated to the prison system (CDCR, 2009b). Cognitive developmental program results overall fare positively; however, many program studies are often inconclusive due to poor research methods or pool samples that lack a true representation of the prison population.

Researchers have taken steps to improve the way research is conducted on the various programs, mainly by comparing large numbers of similar programs in one study, which makes the study easier to duplicate and is important in validity and generalizations (Gendreau & Andrews, 1990). It is imperative that the researcher conduct a carefully planned and well-executed research project on the effectiveness of the AVP workshop that can be used to make recommendations to prison administrators, government and community agencies, and conflict resolution programs.

In a thesis written by Logan-Ellis (2010), *The Board: Effective Multi-Theoretical Model for Treatment of the Substance-Abusing Offender*, the author explored the elements involved in creating effective therapeutic interventions, such as the board

exercise that addresses criminal patterns of thinking and behaving in substance-abusing prisoners from a sociocultural and multitheoretical viewpoint. The theories of cognitive behavioral therapy, motivational interviewing techniques, 12-step programs, the therapeutic community model, and depth psychotherapy techniques are incorporated in the Short Term Intensive Remediation Residential Treatment program (STIRRT) in which *The Board* intervention is used. These diverse approaches work with understanding of change that the clients hold about their own ability to alter their substance abuse and criminal behavior. Using their theoretical approach, Logan-Ellis proposed that the substance abusers concern with power due to the experience of trauma underlies the symptoms of substance abuse and criminal behavior and can be effectively addressed to reduce relapse and recidivism.

Chris Hansen's (2008) report in the *Federal Probation Journal*, "Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions: Where They Come From and What They Do," explored the theory that CBT might be effective in reducing recidivism, thus alleviating the need to build additional prisons. Hansen stressed the importance of fidelity in the delivery of a CBT program. A poorly delivered program along with failure to follow the CBT curriculum will have diminished results (Hansen, 2008). Hansen continued by evaluating several CBT programs that have been especially effective among incarcerated populations: Moral Recognition Therapy (MRT), Reasoning and Rehabilitation, and Thinking for a Change (T4C). Each of these programs is administered inside a correctional facility to currently incarcerated individuals.

Hansen (2008) concluded his review of these programs by stating, “Cognitive behavioral programs have been shown to reduce recidivism as long as the programs are implemented well. As with any program . . . evaluation of effectiveness should occur” (p. 49).

Farrell (2011) in *The Effects of Prison Programs on Prisoner Adjustment* explored additional fundamental elements beyond “typical” day-to-day prison programming as a tool to aid in recidivism. This study considered the rewards of prison programming as a tool for facilitating an effective adaptation to prison. The study assessed the impact of prison programming on “prisonization” levels, institutional infractions, and a participant’s outlook for the future. A total of 74 exoffenders participated in the research by completing a survey instrument. Results indicted a direct correlation between amount of time spent in the program, and incarceration level as well as those involved in programming having a more positive outlook (Farrell, 2011).

Maggioncalda (2007) explored the relationship between inmate motivation and involvement in her study *Inmate Motivations to Participate in Prison Programs; Are They Related to Actual Participation?* Maggioncalda believed that participation in prison programming reduces redivism rates and improves living conditions inside prisons. His study explored this relationship and the effects one has on the other through multiple regression analysis. In looking at this relationship between participation and motivation, four variables were identified: cognitive control, goal orientation, activity orientation, and avoidance posture. A scale was used to measure these factors; the variable was the participatory behavior of each inmate in the study or the number of programs each

individual completed. A majority of the inmates who participated in this study (87%) cited “goal orientation” as a motivating factor of completing programs and participating in programming. These findings are consistent with other literature in this field. This study was limited by the limitations a correctional setting presents in a prison environment. This study demonstrated a need for program opportunities and increased prison program capacity (Maggioncalda, 2007).

“Reducing Prison Misconducts: What Works!” was a meta-analysis by French and Gendreau (2006) to assess the effectiveness of correctional treatment on institutional infractions. This study evaluated the effectiveness of therapy in a correctional setting and whether the needs of offenders are being met or criminogenic needs (i.e., education, substance abuse, parenting, anger management, and mental health), are being addressed. The results of this study indicated a reduction in recidivism when treatment was applied and the prison environment remained safe and humane. Offender misconduct was reduced drastically when criminogenic needs were addressed and therapeutic environments were established.

Patricia C. Stern (2011), in her dissertation, examined the effectiveness of a cognitive behavioral program for prisoners. *Thinking for Change* was administered to inmates housed at a high-medium security facility in Oklahoma. In Stern’s study, she examined the effectiveness of this program to reduce recidivism among participants. Inmates were screened according to length of stay, literacy capabilities, and time they spent on the waiting list.

Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP)

The [Alternatives to Violence Project \(AVP\)](#) program started in prisons in the United States in 1975 with a group of inmates at Green Haven Prison (NY) and currently operates in communities, schools, colleges, and conflict situations worldwide. The AVP program started when a group of inmates began working with youth coming into conflict with the law. Many of the youth were gang members. They collaborated with the Quaker Project on Community Conflict, during a 3-day prison workshop. The principle of the Quaker religion is strongly rooted in the belief of nonviolence and tolerance for others and their beliefs (AVP International, 1999).

The success of this workshop on anger management quickly generated requests for more workshops, and AVP was in great demand. The program quickly spread to many other prisons.

According to AVP International, the program has been described as helping people:

Our workshops use the shared experience of participants, interactive exercises, games and role-plays to examine the ways in which we respond to situations where injustice, prejudice, frustration and anger can lead to aggressive behaviour and violence.

An AVP workshop can help you to:

- manage strong feelings such as anger and fear
- deal more effectively with risk and danger
- build good relationships with other people
- communicate well in difficult situations
- recognize[sic] the skills you already have and learn new ones
- be true to yourself while respecting other people
- understand why conflict happens. (AVP International, 1999, p. 1)

The mission of AVP is to empower people to lead nonviolent lives through affirmation and respect for all. This is accomplished by doing exercises that focus on

community building, cooperation, and trust. Upon entry into an AVP workshop, the first exercise the participants are asked to participate in is an “Adjective Name” game. They must use the letter or sound of their first name and match it with a positive affirmation making this their new name while they are in the AVP workshops. John becomes Joyful John, or Hal may be Handsome Hal, and Mike is now mindful Mike. The participants are then taken through a series of exercises that build trust and assist in building a community. Concentric circles is one method used; the participants are placed in two circles, one on the outside and one on the inside; they face each other, and as the facilitator reads a series of questions, one person is designated the “listener” the other is the “speaker.” The conversation is timed and they are asked to either speak or listen for a period of 2 minutes. The questions are at first superficial, but as is the practice with AVP, they become more in-depth, and the speakers are encouraged to delve a little deeper each turn. The participants rotate on the inside and move from chair to chair as the questions continue.

The awareness that emerges from these workshops is developed from the real-life experiences of prisoners and others, and building on a spiritual base, AVP encourages every person’s innate power to positively transform themselves and the world.

AVP/USA is an association of community-based groups and prison-based groups offering experiential workshops in personal growth and creative conflict management. The national organization provides support for the work of these local groups (AVP International, 1999). The conceptual development of the program is the driving force of its success. AVP programs promote personal growth by creating a sense of community,

building interpersonal trust, enhancing self-worth and self-esteem, and by helping individuals develop important social skills (Bishchoff, 2003). According to research (Curreen, 1994), inmates generally perceive AVP workshops as a positive and valuable experience. They exhibit a shift in their perception of anger, and a shift in the preference toward nonviolent alternatives to conflict resolution is evident (Curreen, 1994).

According to Curreen's (1994) study, *The Alternatives to Violence Project: An Evaluation of a Programme at Auckland Prison East Division*, a standardized measurement assessment called State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI) was used to evaluate participants. Curreen examined prisoners enrolled in the AVP workshop's dispositions and responses to anger. The STAXI consists of six scales measuring the intensity of anger and the disposition to experience angry feelings. Items were rated on a 4-point scale assessing the intensity of anger at a particular moment and the frequency of anger experience, expression, and control (Curreen, 1994). The Staxi was administered to the inmates before the AVP program and after the program. STAXI measures perceptions of anger and not their behaviors.

Although several studies have been conducted on the efficacy of AVP workshops, there is a limited amount of published research. Several researches have complained that the findings have been inconclusive and lacked methodological information provided in most reports (Cordon & Segovia, 2008).

To date, there has not been a study conducted on the efficacy of the AVP program in a prison in the state of California, even though, according to the U.S. Department of Justice (2010) statistics, California has the largest inmate population in the nation.

Additionally, according to the AVP national database, it has been reported that approximately 7,983 inmates have participated in the AVP program in the state of California between 2002 and 2011. Of these inmates, approximately 3,035 have experienced the AVP workshops in California and over 400 at the California State Prison of Solano (AVP/USA).

California State Prison-Solano, Vacaville, California

California State Prison (CSP) Solano was opened August 1984, spans 146 acres, and has an annual budget of \$158.4 million. The number of custody staff currently employed at CSP-Solano is 775. The number of support services staff (i.e., secretaries, office assistants, and analysts) is 380. There are 153 medical staff, for a accumulative total of 1, 308 employees working at CSP-Solano.

The primary mission of CSP-Solano is to provide custody, care and treatment, and rehabilitative programs for those inmates committed to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation by the courts. CSP-Solano is designed as a medium security institution to provide housing for general population inmates. When the prison opened in 1984, it was administered by the warden of the California medical facility. In January 1992, the two prisons were separated administratively and a warden was assigned to each prison (CDCR, 2009b). CSP-Solano focuses on providing a comprehensive work/training program with academic education, vocational training, and industries assignments geared toward providing inmates with work skills and education. Additionally, the institution has a variety of self-help programs including AA, NA,

Veterans, VORG (Victim Offender Reconciliation Group), POP (Prison Outreach Program), and the AVP program.

Through the educational and vocational training, industries assignments, and self-help programs, the institution provides inmates with the opportunity to develop the life skills necessary for successful reintegration into society. The institution is comprised of four separate, semiautonomous facilities, a 400-bed Administrative Segregation Unit (AD Seg), and a 16-bed Correctional Treatment Center.

Summary

Children today face very different problems than children of the past. Children of the 1950s and 1960s used to worry about getting the newest Willie Mays Baseball for Christmas, playing stick ball after school or building the fastest box car for the annual Box Car Derby. Life has changed dramatically since then. Kerby Anderson (1995) found that more than half the children questioned said they were afraid of violent crime against them or a family member. These children were not paranoid; their fears were very real. The article stated,

It turns out this is not some irrational fear based upon a false perception of danger. Life has indeed become more violent and more dangerous for children. Consider the following statistics: One in six youths between the ages of 10 and 17 has seen or knows someone who has been shot. The estimated number of child abuse victims increased 40 percent between 1985 and 1991. Children under 18 were 244 percent more likely to be killed by guns in 1993 than they were in 1986. Violent crime has increased by more than 560 percent since 1960. (Anderson, 1995, para. 3)

Prison violence is a topic that warrants consideration. Violence in the prison system and its causes is the center of many hours of debate among prison administrators,

state legislature, “Joe citizen” and those who actually work in the prison system itself. It’s the old, “which came first, the chicken or the egg?” argument. Are we incarcerating violent people or, is the prison system creating violent offenders? That is the question. Many factors play a part in plaguing the prisons with violence. Racism is said to be one of the catalysts for violence in California’s state prisons. Inmates are housed and separated according to their race. Inmates find themselves having to declare upon arrest “White, Black, Hispanic, or Other.” Researchers argue this division is the beginning of separatism and racial centered unrest.

Some scholars believe it is a case of the chicken arriving to prison with the rage and anger, a victim of society’s oppression and racism. The prison system magnifies feelings of isolation, oppression, and marginalization the minority feels living in this country. The rage came first and incarceration is a result of that rage.

Rocheleau (2011) believed that prisoners can be taught how to cope with their anger and develop coping tools to aide then in navigating the prison system. Cognitive behavior programs are tool often used to combat violence in prison, low self-esteem, and to arm inmates with survival techniques. Maggioncalda (2007) believed that participating in this kinds of self-help programs while incarcerated lowers the rate if recidivism among those inmates involved in behavior modification. Farrell (2011) examined the use of positive prison programming, and more extracurricular activities for the incarcerated to participate in. He examined the factors that cause inmates to participate in “positive programming” and how these factors correlate with the reduction of recidivism, would aid in lowering recidivism rates.

The AVP is another program offered to inmates. Walrath (2001) stated that “the primary goal of AVP programs is the modification of individual attitudes and behaviors that lead to acts of violence” (p. 698). Additionally, AVP arms the inmates with coping ability, survival techniques, and skills to deal with conflict nonviolently. Presently it is offered in 18 of the 33 California state prisons, and is an experiential behavior modification program that teaches inmates ownership of present and past behaviors, recognizing anger triggers, forgiving others as well as themselves, and recognizing the basic need for everyone to be acknowledged for who they are.

In this chapter, one common thread that ran through each of the references reviewed was “violence”—societal violence, violence in the schools, media, and state prison. The literature strongly suggests that intervention is needed to break the cycle of violence among the incarcerated population. Whether it is cognitive behavior programs, positive programming or the AVP, it is not clear which program emphatically reduces recidivism, lowers violence in prisons, or alters inmate’s behaviors. What is clear is that something has to be done to diminish the levels of violence this country faces daily.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The intent of this study was to determine if participation in the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) workshops could be linked to a reduction in disciplinary infractions among inmates who volunteered to take the workshop. A comparison of AVP participant disciplinary infractions prior to taking the AVP workshop to the number of infractions after workshop participation was made. This chapter contains the purpose of the study, research questions, and methodology. It also includes the research design, population sample, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis, and limitations of the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if inmates who participated in the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) had a reduction in behavioral misconduct based on archival data (Central Files) contained in the Disciplinary file at California State Prison (CSP) Solano. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine if the level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) in AVP programs indicates differences in misconduct reports.

Research Questions

1. What are the effects (reduced incidents of violent behavior) of the AVP program on inmates housed at CSP-Solano based on archival data recorded in Central Files?
2. Does the level of participation in the AVP program (Basic, Advance, and T4T), make a difference in the effects (reduced incidents of behavioral misconduct or violent behavior) as recorded in archival data in Central Files at CSP-Solano?
3. Is there a reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct (violent behavior) at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who have previously had disciplinary infractions?
4. Is there a difference in reduction of behavioral misconduct for inmates based on demographic factors of race, age, and education?

Hypotheses

The following are the hypotheses for this study:

1. Participants in participating in the AVP program will have a reduced rate of violence.
2. The level of workshop participation will influence the incidents of violence.

Research Type and Design

This study utilized a causal-comparative ex post facto design. When translated literally, ex post facto means “from what is done afterwards” (Morrison, Cohen, & Manion, 2000, p. 205). In the context of social and educational research, the phrase means “after the fact” or “retrospectively” and refers to those studies that investigate possible cause-and-effect relationships by observing an existing condition or state of

affairs and searching back in time for plausible causal factors. In effect, researchers ask themselves what factors seem to be associated with certain occurrences, or conditions, or aspects of behavior (Morrison, Cohen, & Manion, 2000).

Due to the rise in violence in state prisons, CSP-Solano instituted behavior modification programs to reduce the violence in prison against inmates, staff, and the community. In an effort to examine the impact of the behavior modification programs, this study examined only the AVP instituted at CSP-Solano. This study compared the number of disciplinary infractions located in the Central File (archival data) of inmates who voluntarily participated in the AVP workshops. The purpose of this study was to determine if inmates who participated in the Alternatives to Violence Program (AVP) had a reduction in behavioral misconduct based on archival data (Central Files) contained in the Disciplinary file at California State Prison (CSP) Solano. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine if the level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) in AVP programs indicates differences in misconduct reports.

More specifically the study's focus was to analyze the number of disciplinary incidents of inmates before taking the AVP workshops to those after taking the AVP workshops. The study examined Central File disciplinary records of inmates who participated in the AVP workshops between March 2009 and October 2011 in an effort to investigate what influence taking the AVP workshops has on disciplinary infractions categorized as "violent behavior" on inmates who participated in AVP workshops. Additional descriptive statistics were collected on all participants of this study. The statistics include date of original incarceration, penal code violation, birthday, ethnicity,

education level (high school graduate, college graduate, no high school diploma), TABE score (Test of Adult Basic Education reading Level), CSRA rate (California Static Risk Assessment rate to recidivate, high, med, low), and AVP Experience (Basic, Advance, T4T).

Authors on research design methodology, Mitchell and Jolley believed that ex post facto research takes advantage of data a researcher has already collected. Therefore, the quality of ex post facto research depends on the quantity and quality of the data a researcher has collected during the original study. The more information a researcher collects about his or her participants' personal characteristics, the more ex post facto hypothesis he or she can examine. The more valid one's measures, the more construct validity his or her conclusions will have (Mitchell & Jolley, 2010).

Population

As of February 27, 2012, California is housing 251,576 incarcerated men and women in their jails and prisons. There are 33 prisons in the California penal system; of these, only two state prisons house women. Of the over 251,000 figure, 7,329 are women, 4,117 are housed in camps, 9,454 are imprisoned out of state in Arizona, Mississippi, or Oklahoma; and an additional 97,117 inmates are on some form of state supervision in the community. There are 141,361 incarcerated due to felonious crimes, 382 are civil addicts, and currently, there are 11,004 inmates on parole in the state of California. The length of incarceration may range from 3 years to life without the possibility of parole (CDCR, 2012).

CSP-Solano is located in Vacaville, California, and houses male incarcerated inmates. An inmate's classification determines the type of housing in which he will be placed. Level I or II inmates may be housed in open dormitory settings. Level III and IV inmates are placed in 180-degree or 270-celled housing units. The number of degrees refers to the view from a central elevated control booth. The "180-degree" design is a configuration of the cellblocks (housing units). The cellblocks are partitioned into three separate, self-contained sections, forming a half circle (180 degrees). The partitioning of sections, blocks, and facilities ensures maximum control of movement and quick isolation of disruptive incidents, thereby ensuring effective overall management of inmates. In addition to open dormitories and cell units, there are the following special housing units:

Security Housing Unit (SHU): The most secure area within a Level IV prison designed to provide maximum coverage. These are designed to house inmates who cannot be housed with the general population of inmates. This includes inmates who are validated prison gang members or gang leaders. SHU terms can vary in length.

Administrative Segregation (ASU): Similar in design to a SHU, ASU houses inmates for up to 30 days, or longer with approval from a Classification Staff Representative (CSR). Inmates are placed into ASU to resolve issues that concern the safety of the inmate, the safety of others, or who jeopardize the security of the institution. ASU may also house inmates as Disciplinary Detention for up to 10 days as a disposition resulting from a guilty finding on serious infractions.

Reception Center (RC): Provides short-term housing to process, classify, and evaluate incoming inmates.

Condemned (Cond): Holds inmates with death sentences. (CDCR, 2011, p. 20)

CSP-Solano is a Level II/III combination prison. The current population of CSP-Solano is 4,560. This population is in alignment with the other 10 prisons that are in the same mission or category as CSP-Solano. Prison population varies according to the level

of the prison, the category the prison is in (i.e., reception center, medical facility, or women's), and the prison design capacity. Inmates housed at Solano are imprisoned for various reasons. Incarceration charges range from murder, manslaughter, robbery, assault, sex offenses, kidnapping, burglary, larceny, vehicle theft, forgery/fraud, property, drugs, and DUI (CDCR, 2012).

Missions divide the 33 prisons in the California penal system. The missions are categories in four areas. The first is General Population, Female Programs, Reception Centers, and High Security. Solano's mission is General Population. Within that mission are nine prisons; of those nine prisons, five are the same security level as Solano. Of the five Level II/III security prisons four currently offer AVP workshops.

Accessible Population

The accessible population is the population in research to which the researchers can apply their conclusions. This population is a subset of the target population and is also known as the study population. It is from the accessible population that researchers draw their samples (Castillo, 2009). The accessible population of this study consists of 195 Level II inmates housed at CSP-Solano between March 2009 and October 2011 who have participated in at least one level of the AVP workshops. The inmates housed at CSP-Solano reflect the inmate population incarcerated at the other nine institutions within the CDCR's General Population mission. All nine institutions are Level II/III prisons, all institutions house male prisoners, and each institution houses inmates incarcerated for a variety of felons. Of the nine institutions, five, including CSP-Solano,

offer AVP workshops for its prisoners. The workshops are attended strictly on a volunteer basis, and can be taken on three levels.

At CSP-Solano, inmates were notified of upcoming AVP workshops by flyers displayed in housing units; anyone interested in taking the workshop can sign up utilizing a “Request for Interview” form addressed to the program coordinator. Participation in the AVP workshops is on a voluntary first-come, first-serve basis. Inmates located in Administration Segregation and the infirmary do not have access to the AVP workshops, as their current housing prohibits them from interacting with the general population. All requests are logged and date stamped to ensure program assignment equality. Workshops are filled by the waiting list. There are no actions taken to balance the workshops by race, yards, housing units, or custody levels. Each workshop holds 20 participants; names are assigned from the waiting list, 20 at a time in sequential order.

A total of 256 prisoners incarcerated at CSP-Solano in Vacaville, California, participated in AVP workshops between March 2009 and October 2011. Data were collected on all 256 participants. However, 29 inmates were paroled during the time of this study and 25 transferred to other institutions; therefore, the Central File was no longer located at CSP-Solano and was not accessible. Seven Central Files were not available during the 2-week period information was gleaned, leaving a target population of 195 participants for this study.

Sampling

In most situations, researchers try to obtain the desired data by surveying a subset, or sample, of the population. Hopefully, this should allow one to generalize the

characteristics observed in the sample to the entire target population, inevitably accepting some margin of error, which depends on a wide range of factors. However, generalization to the whole population is not always possible—or worse, it may be misleading (Mazzocchi, 2008).

Convenience sample or sampling is a sample or method of sampling in which cases are selected because of the convenience of accessing them and not because they are thought to be representative of the population. Unless some form of representative or random sampling has been employed, most samples are of this nature (Cramer & Howitt, 2004). A sampling of 195, a number that represents every participant who took the workshop between March 2009 and October 2010 and whose file was available for data extraction, was used to conduct this study.

Convenience sampling generally assumes a homogeneous population, and that one person is pretty much like another. One of the most common types of nonprobability sample is called a convenience sample—not because such samples are necessarily easy to recruit, but because the researcher uses whatever individuals are available rather than selecting from the entire population (Herek, 2008). Because some members of the population have no chance of being sampled, the extent to which a convenience sample—regardless of its size—actually represents the entire population cannot be known (Good & Hardin, 2009). Of the Central Files, 195 were used to extrapolate data and examine trends. Those participants removed from the study were paroled, transferred, or the Central File was not available during the time the researcher gleaned the information for this research.

Instrumentation

In quantitative research, it is very common for archival data to be used that were not generated by the researcher. With respect to qualitative data, the idea of the researcher generating the data runs completely contrary to the interpretive belief that phenomena should be studied as they occur naturally (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

For the social scientist, archival research can be defined as the locating, evaluating, and systematic interpretation and analysis of sources found in archives. Original source materials may be consulted and analyzed for purposes other than those for which they were originally collected—to ask new questions of old data, provide a comparison over time or between geographic areas, verify or challenge existing findings, or draw together evidence from disparate sources to provide a bigger picture (Lewis-Beck, Bryman, & Liao, 2004).

The data source to be utilized for this study is the CDCR Central Files located at CSP-Solano. The Central File is a manual-based information system every inmate housed in a California state prison obtains the first day of incarceration. Incarcerated individuals are given a unique alphanumeric identifier, the CDCR number, and a case file is generated for them. No two numbers are the same. When an inmate transfers from one institution to another or paroles, the file that was originally generated for him the first time he was incarcerated goes with him. If he or she violates his parole and is reincarcerated, he or she will have the same file and CDCR number for his or her new case factors; the inmate's number will never change. The Central File contains information on offender prison placement, intake assessment, case management, sentence

management, security classification, disciplinary records, program participation, race, education history, medical factors, reading level, California Static Risk Assessment rate (a predicted recidivism rate/score) scores, and inmate grievances or appeals.

Information regarding the participants in this study's disciplinary record, original incarceration offense, and statistical demographics were taken from the Central File. The researcher obtained permission from the California Department of Correction's Research Division to conduct this study. A data sheet was created. The AVP Participant Data Worksheet was used to collect the data located in the participant's Central File (see Appendix A). The collection of data did not use any name or identifier that would violate confidentiality of the inmates. All data sheets were coded with random numbers protecting the identity of the inmate.

The reliability of the information gathered from the Central File was assured. The Central File is the main data source for every prison in the state of California. Every inmate within the CDCR penal system has a Central File. Every other system within the CDCR gathers information and generates statistical data from the CDCR Central File. A letter of request was submitted to the Deputy Director Rich Subia asking for permission to use the Central File as a resource of data for this study. Mr. Subia granted permission. Secondly, CDCR granted the researcher access to the Central Files located at CSP-Solano (see Appendix A, letter of permission). The AVP Participant Data Worksheet ensured that the same data were collected for each member of the sample.

Data Collection

The CDCR maintains a Central File on every prisoner housed in its penal system. CSP-Solano provided the archival data for the inmates housed at CSP-Solano for this study. An AVP Participation Data Worksheet was created for the sole purpose of ensuring consistency, accuracy, and anonymity for each of the participants in this study. In addition to disciplinary infractions, the following information was taken from the Central Files of the AVP participants: (a) date of original incarceration; (b) penal code violation; (c) violent/not violent; (d) birthday; (e) ethnicity; (f) education experience (GED, HS diploma, none); (g) TABE - Test of Adult Basic Education (Reading Level); (h) CSRA California Static Risk Assessment (rate to recidivate, high, med, low); (i) AVP Experience (Basic, Advance, T4T); (j) write ups (Any disciplinary infraction that is a write-up causing the inmate to add additional months to his or her incarceration sentence, cause the inmate to receive work or an assignment as punishment or a formal admonishment entered into their file never to be removed).

The data were collected over a period of October 5, 2011 - November 12, 2011. The data were then tabulated and analyzed. The data provided information about AVP and an overall demographic picture of the inmate population. Analyzing these data provided a clear picture of the AVP participants.

Data Analysis

The focus of this study was to examine whether participating in the AVP workshops affected the occurrences of violence at California State Prison Solano. The archival data were analyzed using descriptive procedures. All quantitative data collected

were from the Central Files of participants of AVP workshops. An analysis was conducted of all disciplinary infractions of inmates who participated in the AVP workshops. The data were coded and entered into a Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) for analysis.

The paired-samples t test procedure compares the means of two variables for a single group. The procedure computes the differences between values of the two variables for each case and tests whether the average differs from 0. For each variable, the mean, sample size, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean were gathered and for each pair of variables, the correlation, average difference in means, t test, and confidence interval for mean difference were calculated. The paired-samples t test was conducted to find the standard deviation and standard error of the mean difference.

For the purpose of this research, “Violent incidents” were defined as physical acts of violence committed by one or more inmates against one or more staff members, inmates, or visitors. Violent incidents include assault, battery, murder, hostage taking, sexual assault, kidnapping, participating in a riot, behavior that can lead to a riot, and inciting a riot. Data were collected from those participants in the study noting all disciplinary incidents, violent or nonviolent. The researcher also looked at the date of the occurrence, recording whether the incident happened before the participant attended the AVP workshop or after attending the AVP workshop. Gathering both sets of numbers allowed for a comparison and assisted the researcher in identifying trends among those enrolled in the study. The advantage of placing the data collected and background

characteristics into a table, particularly contingency tables is that it allowed the researcher a clear visual of trends and variances.

Validity

A threat to a study's internal validity is the researcher's ability to correctly draw cause-and-effect inferences that may arise because of the experimental procedures (Creswell, 2005). According to Salkind (2003), "Reliability and validity are the hallmarks of good measurement" (p. 105). Each time an inmate commits an infraction, a classification hearing is held, the inmate is present, the findings are upheld, dismissed, or reduced. Whatever the results are, they are documented in the inmate's Central File. If the inmate appeals the process, the results of each level of that appeal are also archived in his Central File. Every Central File is unique to each incarcerated individual. Each inmate has only one Central File; the inmate has the opportunity twice a year to review the file and request any document in the file he finds to be illegally placed, erroneously submitted, or not belonging to him removed. Each time an inmate is charged with a rule violation, the infraction is recorded, validated by the inmate's signature and the presiding custody representative, then logged into his Central File. This process ensures that the correct documents—disciplinary documentation, demographic information, and official papers—are maintained in the Central file (CDCR, 2012).

Age maturity may be a factor for significant disciplinary reductions. There may be a natural maturity that is achieved with time causing the inmate to change past behaviors and comply with CDCR rules and policies. This factor may cause a reduction in incident reports.

An additional factor that must be considered when examining internal validity is the change in the adjudication process and rules violation definitions. During the time an inmate is incarcerated, several mandates may be implemented applying rigorous disciplinary policies and a shorter time for appeal. The initiation of these new practices may prove to be a deterrent for some inmates, yet a barrier for others. This may be a factor in the increase or decrease of disciplinary reports.

Resilience is a natural adaption to one's environment. The inmate may have been incarcerated for so long that he or she finally adapts to the rules and regulations. There is a natural progression that happens over time. The length of the participant's incarceration may play a factor in the increase or decrease of disciplinary events.

Limitations

The following are limitations that must be recognized in this study.

1. The major limitation of this study is those inherent in a causal-comparative ex post facto design.
2. The researcher works at the institution being studied; therefore, there may be a possibility of researcher bias.
3. Data gathering was done manually and thus may increase the chances of errors.
4. While the Central File may be an important data source, for this study, it has several limitations. First, the data may not be as accurate or as impartial as expected because the data regarding disruptive behavior is based on the discretion of the staff member at the current institution. For example, there may be a write up in the participants file for an infraction that occurred at one institution, but the same event may warrant a

warning at another institution. Second, it is difficult to know the extent to which correctional officers consistently and objectively apply institutional rules and the degree to which investigating officers follow policies and procedures when reporting incidents. Third, policies and procedures have changed significantly in the last 10 years. What once was an infraction (i.e., grooming standards), is no longer in existence; and policies that did not exist (i.e., smoking bans and cell phone prohibition) now exist. The levels of violation have changed, that is the penalties associated with the first, second, and third time infractions.

5. Data collected from this study focused on the records of inmates in the AVP.

Furthermore, the total number of participants in the study, 259, represents .51% of the current population housed at CSP-Solano. This is relatively small; therefore generalization across specific demographic settings as well as the total population of inmates at CSP-Solano may be limited or misleading.

Summary

This chapter presented the methodology utilized in this study. It included a review of the purpose statement and research questions, a description of the research design, instrument, procedures, and population and sample of the study. Chapter III concluded with data collection procedures and data analysis measures, validation of findings, and study limitations.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This study examined the effects of the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) program on inmates housed at California State Prison (CSP) Solano, in Vacaville, California. The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings for each of the four research questions that guided this study. This chapter includes a review of the purpose statement, the research questions, the methodology, and a description of the population examined in this study. The findings from the data are presented primarily in narrative format. Tables are included to highlight and support the narrative reporting. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine if inmates who participated in the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) had a reduction in behavioral misconduct based on archival data (Central Files) contained in the Disciplinary file at California State Prison (CSP) Solano. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine if the level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) in AVP programs indicates differences in misconduct reports.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. What are the effects (reduced behavioral misconduct incidents of violent behavior) of the AVP program on inmates housed at CSP-Solano based on archival data recorded in Central Files?
2. Does the level of participation in the AVP program (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) make a difference in the effects (reduced incidents of behavioral misconduct or violent behavior) as recorded in archival data in Central Files at CSP-Solano?
3. Is there a reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who have previously had disciplinary infractions?
4. Is there a difference in reduction of behavioral misconduct for inmates based on demographic factors of race, age, and education?

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no reduction of behavioral misconduct for inmates who participated in the AVP program as documented in archival data (Central Files).
2. There is no difference in the reduction of incidents of behavioral misconduct as recorded in archival data in Central Files at CSP-Solano by level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T).
3. There is no reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who previously had disciplinary infractions as indicated by inmate disciplinary records pre- and postparticipation in AVP.

4. There is no difference in the reduction of behavioral misconduct for inmates based on demographic factors of race, age, and education.

Methodology

Quantitative research using data analysis was used to examine the effects of the AVP on inmate behaviors. Data were gathered through information collected from each participant's Central File and attendance statistics retained through the AVP. The AVP files contained names of participants, their CDCR number, the date the participant attended the workshop, how many workshops were attended, and ethnicity. All of the data gathered were calculated and categorized. The findings were compared to the literature to ascertain those supported by the literature and identify those not found in the literature. Final findings and arguments derived from the data analysis were presented in a narrative and table format.

Participant Description

CSP-Solano currently houses 4,536 inmates (CDCR, 2012). Between March 2009 and October 2011, a total of 256 inmates participated in the AVP workshops. This study incorporates information from the Central Files of those participants. Data were collected on all 256 participants; however, 29 were paroled during the time of this study and 25 were transferred to other institutions; therefore, the Central File for those inmates was no longer located at CSP-Solano and was not accessible. Additionally, seven Central Files were not available during the 2-week period information was gleaned, leaving a candidate pool of 195 participants' files available to utilize data for this study.

Of the 195 participants, 107 were African American, representing more than half (55%) of those included in the study, 7% were Hispanic, 27% were White, and 11% were of other races. One participant's ethnicity was undetermined. Statewide, the racial demographics of incarcerated men housed in the California Department of Corrections prisons are African American, 29.2%; Hispanic, 41.0%; White, 23.5%; and Other, 6.3% (CDCR, 2012). These data indicate that there was a larger percentage of African Americans and a smaller percentage of Hispanics represented in this study compared to the statewide figures. Table 1 presents the reported racial demographics of the participants.

Table 1

AVP Participant Demographics by Race

Race of participants	<i>N</i>	Percentage represented in study
African American	107	55%
Hispanic	13	7%
White	53	27%
Other	21	11%
Total	194	100%

Note. *One participant's ethnicity was undetermined.

A total of 195 incarcerated male offenders, ages 18 to 77, participated in this study. Table 2 presents the reported age demographics of the participants. The largest group of respondents (46%) was between the ages of 43 and 52. Only a small percentage of the participants (2%) were younger than 33.

Table 2

AVP Participant Demographics by Age

Age of participants	<i>N</i>	Percentage represented in study
18-32	4	2%
33-42	55	28%
43-52	90	46%
53-62	37	19%
63-72	7	4%
73-77	2	1%
Total	195	100%

Table 3 presents the reported original incarcerated offense classification of the participants. Of the participants, 168 (86%) were originally incarcerated for violent offenses, and 27 (14%) were arrested for nonviolent offenses. Violent offenses include homicide, robbery, assault and battery, sex offenses, and kidnapping.

Table 3

AVP Participant Demographics by Incarcerated Offense

Original offense	<i>N</i>	Percentage represented in study
Violent	168	86%
Nonviolent	27	14%
Total	195	100%

Inmates participating in this study were arrested for various infractions; therefore, the length of incarceration for each participant varied. Table 4 represents the participants' length of stay to date in 5-year increments. The largest groups of participants have been incarcerated for between 16-20 years (29%) and 21-25 years

(27%). As of December 2011, 45.2% of men were incarcerated for violent acts. Crimes range from murder 1st, murder 2nd, manslaughter, vehicular manslaughter, robbery, assault with a deadly weapon, other assault/battery, rape, lewd acts with child, oral copulation, sodomy, penetration with an object, other sex offenses, and kidnapping. These crimes carry longer sentences (CDCR, 2012).

Table 4

AVP Participant Demographics Length of Incarceration

Years in CDCR	<i>N</i>	Percentage represented in study
1-5 years	11	6%
6-10 years	3	2%
11-15 years	30	15%
16-20 years	57	29%
21-25 years	53	27%
26-30 years	31	16%
31 years or more	10	5%
Total	195	100%

Table 5 represents the educational experiences of participants in this study. Educational experiences and levels varied by participant. Just over a third of participants (35%) have their GED. About one in four (26%), however, do not have a GED and did not complete high school.

The Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) is designed to assess reading, mathematics, language, and spelling skills. It also includes a version in Spanish and independent tests that assess basic skills in work-related contexts. TABE is the assessment test used by the CDCR to determine if an inmate will be placed in academic

Table 5

AVP Participant Demographics by Education Experience

Education	<i>N</i>	Percentage represented in study
High school graduate	44	23%
College graduate	22	11%
No H.S. graduate/no GED	51	26%
No info. reported	9	5%
Total	195	100%

classes, vocational courses, a support waiting list (employment workability) or be allowed to pursue independent study for college courses. The TABE levels represent the range of content difficulty typically found in educational programs at the grades indicated. Examinees may score above or below the range for a given level, depending on their mastery of the skills covered in that level (CTB/McGraw-Hill, 2000). Table 6 represents the TABE levels of the participants of this study. The majority of participants (60%) have a TABE level of between 10.0 and 12.9.

Table 6

AVP Participant Demographics by TABE Levels

TABE level	<i>N</i>	Percentage represented in study
1.0-1.9	2	1%
2.0-2.9	1	.05%
4.0-4.9	2	1%
5.0-5.9	5	2%
6.0-6.9	9	5%
7.0-7.9	15	8%
8.0-8.9	14	7%
9.0-9.9	27	14%
10.0-12.9	118	60%
No TABE score	2	1%

The California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) is a risk prediction tool which estimates individual parolee risk to re-offend using existing data collected by the CDCR, and automated offender “rap sheets” provided to CDCR by the California Department of Justice. Table 7 illustrates AVP participant’s CSRA scores. Almost all participants obtained a risk assessment of low (95%).

Table 7

AVP Participant’s CSRA Scores

CSRA score	<i>N</i>	Percentage represented in study
High	1	.05%
Medium	2	1%
Moderate	7	4%
Low	176	95%
Total	186*	100%

Note. * Nine participants were missing CSRA scores from their Central Files.

Table frequencies in the column Number of Disciplines Before AVP Basic shown in the following tables were calculated by taking the date at which each inmate participated in the AVP Basic workshop (which varied depending on the inmate) and quantifying the number of months between the workshop date and October 2011 (the ending date for gathering and categorizing data). The researcher then looked back to the disciplines prior to the workshop for the same number of months in order to create a parallel time frame pre- and postworkshop. The counts in the column represent how many disciplines were measured during this preworkshop window of analysis.

The frequencies in the column Number of Disciplines After AVP Basic workshop were simply calculated by counting the number of disciplinary dates that occurred for each inmate after he participated in the AVP Basic workshop. These numbers were then summed, and broken out by different demographic characteristics in the tables that follow.

Table 8 portrays the comparisons of the numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by ethnicity (using a parallel time frame for the number of months measured before and after). This table shows that the differences in the number of disciplines before and after the workshop varied only slightly by ethnicity, with African American inmates showing a small increase in the number of disciplines after participating in the Basic workshop (from 18 to 21 disciplines) and those of an ethnicity classified as “other” decreasing in the number of disciplines (from six prior to the workshop to two postworkshop). Overall, the number of disciplines stayed fairly stable, only decreasing by one discipline after the Basic workshop. None of the differences in numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by ethnicity, however, are statistically significant.

Table 8

Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number of disciplines before AVP basic	Number of disciplines after AVP basic
African-American	18	21
Hispanic	3	2
White	5	6
Other	6	2
Overall	32	31

Table 9 portrays the comparisons of numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by age. This table shows that the differences in the number of disciplines before and after the workshop varied somewhat by age, with inmates who are 40-49 showing an increase in the number of disciplines after participating in the Basic workshop (from 15 to 19 disciplines) and those between the ages of 20 and 29 and 50 and 59 showing a decrease in the number of disciplines after participating in the Basic workshop (from three prior to the workshop to none postworkshop for the former group and eight preworkshop and five postworkshop for the latter group). None of the differences in numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by age, however, are statistically significant.

Table 9

Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: Age

Age	Number of disciplines before AVP basic	Number of disciplines after AVP basic
20-29	3	0
30-39	6	7
40-49	15	19
50-59	8	5
60-80	0	0
Overall	32	31

Table 10 portrays the comparisons of numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by education. This table shows that the comparisons of the number of disciplines before and after the workshop varied by education, with inmates who are college graduates measuring a decrease from seven disciplines to only one discipline and

inmates who received a GED decreasing from 12 disciplines to seven. The offsetting increases, however, are for those that are classified with “other” education levels

Table 10

Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: Education

Education	Number of disciplines before AVP basic	Number of disciplines after AVP basic
College graduate	7	1
GED	12	7
High school graduate	9	10
Other	3	9
Overall	31	27

Note: One additional discipline occurred before the AVP Basic workshop, and four additional disciplines occurred after it; however, there was no education information associated with these cases.

(increasing from three disciplines before the workshop to nine disciplines after). The decrease in numbers of disciplines after the AVP Basic workshop for college graduates was statistically significant at the .10 level.

Table 11 portrays the comparisons of numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by TABE score. This table shows that the differences in the number of disciplines before and after the workshop varied somewhat by TABE, with inmates who are classified as having a TABE score of 10.0-12 showing the greatest decrease after participating in the Basic workshop (from 19 to 10 disciplines). Inmates with TABE scores between 7.0 and 7.9 also measured a decrease from six disciplines before to two disciplines after the workshop. The groups that showed the largest increase were those with TABE scores of 5.0-5.9 and 9.0-9.9 (an increase of four disciplines

each). The increase in numbers of disciplines after the AVP Basic workshop for those with a TABE score of 8.0-8.9 was statistically significant at the .10 level.

Table 11

Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: TABE Score

	Number of disciplines before AVP basic	Number of disciplines after AVP basic
1.0-1.9	1	0
2.0-2.9	0	0
4.0-4.9	0	0
5.0-5.9	1	5
6.0-6.9	2	2
7.0-7.9	6	2
8.0-8.9	1	6
9.0-9.9	2	6
10.0-12.9	19	10
Overall	32	31

Table 12 portrays the comparisons of numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by CSRA. The differences in the number of disciplines before and after the workshop varied only slightly by CSRA, with inmates classified as moderate risk showing a small decrease in the number of disciplines after participating in the Basic workshop (from three to zero disciplines). In the remaining groups, there were basically no changes across the two time periods. None of the differences in numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by risk assessment, however, are statistically significant.

Table 12

Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: CSRA

	Number of disciplines before AVP basic	Number of disciplines after AVP basic
High	0	0
Medium	1	2
Moderate	3	0
Low	27	27
Overall	31	29

Note: One additional discipline occurred before the AVP Basic workshop, and two additional disciplines occurred after it; however, there was no education information associated with these cases.

As portrayed in Table 13, interestingly, the type of workshops attended does not appear to be a driver of decreased disciplines (although the number of disciplines measured pre- and postworkshop are too few to be able to make that statement with confidence). Those who attended only the Basic workshop showed a decrease of five disciplines between the two time periods and those that attended both the Basic and Advanced workshops had an increase of four disciplines. None of the differences in numbers of disciplines before and after the AVP Basic workshop by number of workshops attended, however, are statistically significant.

Table 13

Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP Basic: Types of Workshops Attended

Types of workshops attended	Number of disciplines before AVP basic	Number of disciplines after AVP basic
Basic only	19	14
Basic and advanced	13	17
Basic, advanced, and T4T	0	0
Overall	32	31

Given that no major behavioral changes occurred as a result of the AVP workshops when all participants were taken together (including those with and without accounts of behavioral misconduct before the AVP workshop), the researcher decided to analyze the subgroup of the sample who had infractions within the window of analysis prior to the workshop to see if the workshops had an impact on those who are known to have had recent behavior-related issues. The results of this analysis address Research Question 3. Of the inmates with recorded infractions prior to the workshop ($n = 21$), the average number of disciplines decreased from 1.52 before the workshop, to .52 after the workshop, and this decrease is statistically significant (.005). The corresponding total counts are 32 total infractions before the Basic workshop to only 11 postworkshop (across the 21 inmates). The results of this subanalysis are portrayed in Table 14. These data infer that even though the impact of the AVP workshops appear not to have an effect on all inmates who participate in them, they do have an impact on those who had behavioral infractions within the few years prior to the workshops.

Table 14

Comparisons of Number of Disciplines Before and After AVP BASIC Among Those Who Had Infractions Prior to the Workshop

	Before AVP basic	After AVP basic
Total number of infractions	32	11
Average number of infractions	1.52	.52

Note. The data in the table are derived from 21 inmates who had reported disciplinary dates prior to the Basic workshop within the window of analysis.

Summary of the Findings

Of the 195 participants in this study, 55% were African American and 46% of the participants' ages ranged between 43 and 52. Of the participants, 86% were originally incarcerated for violent offenses and 29% of the participants have so far been incarcerated for 16-20 years, followed closely by 27% of the participants, who have been incarcerated for 21-25 years. Over a third of those who were in this study (35%) possessed a GED, and 60% had TABE scores in the 10.0-12.9 range. Almost all of the participants (95%) had "low" CSRA scores and were perceived as less violent than the .05% that had "high" CSRA scores.

The study revealed a decrease of disciplinary infractions after the AVP workshop among Hispanics and those classified as "other ethnicities"; it also revealed an increase in disciplinary infractions among African Americans and Caucasians, although none of these changes are statistically significant. When disciplinary infractions were displayed according to age, the age groups 20-29 and 50-59 displayed the greatest decline of disciplinary infractions; again however, these changes were not statistically significant.

The grouping according to education levels presented a large measurable decrease of infractions among college graduates (from seven to one) and the GED recipients (12 to seven). The first of these comparisons is statistically significant, while the second is not.

Findings for the Research Hypotheses

Research Hypothesis 1

Overall, there is no reduction in behavioral misconduct for inmates who participated in the AVP program as documented in archival data (Central Files). Tables 15 and 16 display the results of disciplinary reports before taking AVP and after AVP.

Table 15

Paired Samples Statistics—Pair 1

Pair 1	Mean	<i>n</i>	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Before AVP	.17	193	.571	.041
After AVP	.16	193	.479	.034

Table 16

Paired Samples Test—Pair 1

Pair 1	Paired differences					<i>t</i>	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% Confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Before AVP–after AVP	.005	.673	.048	-.090	.101	.107	192	.915

The hypothesis that participating in the AVP workshop will not result in a significant reduction of disciplinary infractions overall among all inmates was accepted. The level at which comparisons were deemed statistically significant was a value less than .100; therefore, with a significance level of .915, the hypothesis was accepted.

Research Hypothesis 2

There is no difference in the reduction of incidents of behavioral misconduct as recorded in archival data in Central Files at CSP-Solano by level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T).

Tables 17 and 18 display data gathered in respect to the level of workshops attended. Basic, Advanced, and T-4-T were examined by participation saturation manipulation. That is these tables examine whether the number of workshops influenced reports of disciplinary infractions.

The hypothesis that there is no difference in the reduction of incidents of behavioral misconduct by level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) was accepted. The level at which comparisons were deemed statistically significant was a value less than .100; therefore, with significance levels of .489 and .507, the hypothesis was accepted.

Table 17

Paired Samples Statistics—Workshops

Workshops (Pair 1)	Mean	<i>n</i>	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Basic only				
Before AVP	.37	51	.916	.128
After AVP	.27	51	.666	.093
Basic and advanced				
Before AVP	.09	139	.359	.030
After AVP	.12	139	.389	.033
Basic, advanced, and T4T				
Before AVP	.00 ^a	3	.000	.000
After AVP	.00 ^a	3	.000	.000

Note. ^aThe correlation and *t* cannot be computed because the standard error of the difference is 0.

Table 18

Paired Samples Test^a—Workshops

	Paired differences					<i>t</i>	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% Confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Workshops								
Basic only before AVP–after AVP	.098	1.005	.141	-.185	.381	.697	50	.489
Basic and advanced before AVP–after AVP	-.029	.510	.043	-.114	.057	-.665	138	.507

Note. ^aNo statistics are computed for one or more split files (Basic, Advanced, and T4T).

Research Hypothesis 3

There is a reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who previously had disciplinary infractions as indicated by inmate disciplinary records pre- and postparticipation in AVP.

Tables 19 and 20 display the results of the paired samples test among those with prior infractions.

Table 19

Paired Samples Statistics—Among Those With Prior Infractions

Among those with prior infractions		Mean	<i>n</i>	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pair 1	Before AVP	1.52	21	.981	.214
	After AVP	.52	21	.981	.214

Table 20

Paired Samples Test—Among Those With Prior Infractions

Among those with prior infractions		Paired differences					<i>t</i>	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% confidence interval of the difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Before AVP – After AVP	1.000	1.449	.316	.340	1.660	3.162	20	.005

The hypothesis that participating in AVP program results in no reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct for those who previously had disciplinary infractions was rejected. The level at which comparisons were deemed statistically significant was a value less than .100; therefore, with a significance level of .005 the hypothesis was rejected.

Research Hypothesis 4

There is no difference in the reduction of behavioral misconduct for inmates based on demographic factors of race and age. However, there was a significant decrease in behavior among misconduct for college graduates.

Tables 21-26 display the results of the paired samples test for race, age, and education.

Table 21

Paired Samples Statistics—Race

Race (Pair 1)	Mean	<i>n</i>	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
African American				
Before AVP	.17	106	.593	.058
After AVP	.20	106	.559	.054
Hispanic				
Before AVP	.23	13	.599	.166
After AVP	.15	13	.376	.104
Other				
Before AVP	.30	20	.923	.206
After AVP	.10	20	.308	.069
White				
Before AVP	.09	53	.295	.041
After AVP	.11	53	.375	.052

Table 22

Paired Samples Test—Race

Race	Paired differences					<i>t</i>	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviatio n	Std. error mean	95% Confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
African American before AVP - after AVP	-.028	.696	.068	-.162	.106	-.418	105	.676
Hispanic before AVP - after AVP	.077	.641	.178	-.310	.464	.433	12	.673
Other before AVP - after AVP	.200	1.005	.225	-.270	.670	.890	19	.385
White before AVP - after AVP	-.019	.460	.063	-.146	.108	-.299	52	.766

Table 23

Paired Samples Statistics—Age

Age (Pair 1)	Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
20-29				
Before AVP	1.50	2	2.121	1.500
After AVP	.00	2	.000	.000
30-39				
Before AVP	.17	36	.737	.123
After AVP	.19	36	.467	.078
40-49				
Before AVP	.18	82	.569	.063
After AVP	.23	82	.615	.068
50-59				
Before AVP	.14	57	.398	.053
After AVP	.09	57	.285	.038
60-80				
Before AVP	.00 ^a	16	.000	.000
After AVP	.00 ^a	16	.000	.000

Note. ^aThe correlation and *t* cannot be computed because the standard error of the difference is 0.

Table 24

Paired Samples Test^a—Age

Age (Pair 1)	Paired differences					<i>t</i>	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
20-29 before AVP - after AVP	1.500	2.121	1.500	-17.559	20.559	1.000	1	.500
30-39 before AVP - after AVP	-.028	.774	.129	-.290	.234	-.215	35	.831
40-49 before AVP - after AVP	-.049	.768	.085	-.218	.120	-.575	81	.567
50-59 before AVP – after AVP	.053	.397	.053	-.053	.158	1.000	56	.322

Note. ^aNo statistics are computed for one or more split files (60-80).

Table 25

Paired Samples Statistics—Education

Education (Pair 1)	Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
College grad				
Before AVP	.32	22	.780	.166
After AVP	.05	22	.213	.045
GED				
Before AVP	.17	69	.593	.071
After AVP	.10	69	.304	.037
HS grad				
Before AVP	.21	43	.675	.103
After AVP	.23	43	.684	.104
Other				
Before AVP	.06	50	.314	.044
After AVP	.18	50	.438	.062

Table 26

Paired Samples Test—Education

Education	Paired differences					<i>t</i>	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% Confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
College grad before AVP - after AVP	.273	.703	.150	-.039	.584	1.821	21	.083
GED before AVP - after AVP	.072	.649	.078	-.083	.228	.928	68	.357
HS Grad before AVP - after AVP	-.023	.801	.122	-.270	.223	-.190	42	.850
Other before AVP - after AVP	-.120	.521	.074	-.268	.028	-1.630	49	.110

Because there were no statistically significant differences in the reduction of behavioral misconduct based on the demographic factors of race and age, part of the null hypothesis was accepted. The levels of significance among all of the classifications within these two demographics ranged from .322 to .831. Among inmates who are college graduates, however, there was a reduction of behavioral misconduct as a result of

participation in the AVP workshop; therefore, part of the null hypothesis (referring specifically to education levels) would be rejected. The level at which comparisons were deemed statistically significant was a value less than .100; therefore, with a significance level of .083 among college graduates the hypothesis was rejected. With regard to those with a GED, those who are high school graduates, and “other” education classifications, the hypothesis was accepted (the corresponding significance levels are .357, .850, and .110, respectively).

Summary of Results

Each of the four research questions was answered by the analysis of the data. In answer to Research Question 1, since no statistically significant differences were found in the reduction of disciplinary infractions among all inmates who participated in the AVP program, the hypothesis that participating in the AVP workshop will not result in a significant reduction of disciplinary infractions overall among all inmates was accepted.

In answer to Research Question 2, since no statistically significant differences were found in the reduction of disciplinary infractions by those who participated in differing number of workshops, the hypothesis that there is no difference in the reduction of incidents of behavioral misconduct by level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) was accepted.

In answer to Research Question 3, because there was a statistically significant reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct after the workshop among inmates who had disciplinary infractions prior to the workshop (from 32 misconducts preworkshop to 11 postworkshop), the hypothesis that participating in the AVP program results in no

reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct for those who previously had disciplinary infractions was rejected.

In answer to Research Question 4, because there were no statistically significant differences in the reduction of behavioral misconduct based on demographic factors of race and age, part of the null hypothesis was accepted. Among inmates who are college graduates, however, there was a reduction of behavioral misconduct as a result of participation in the AVP workshop; therefore, part of the null hypothesis (referring specifically to education levels) would be rejected.

When all of the analyses are considered together, it would appear that the AVP workshops are effective in reducing behavioral misconduct for those who previously had disciplinary infractions during their incarcerations and among the more educated inmates. It would therefore seem appropriate to continue offering the workshops, at a minimum, to these two particular types of inmates. However, the effectiveness of the workshops, on average, among all inmates appears to be minimal. Further research of a more longitudinal nature may be necessary to prove or disprove the effectiveness of reducing behavioral misconduct for all inmates across the board.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the study, which includes the problem, purpose statement, research questions, and methodology. Key findings and conclusions drawn from Chapter IV are discussed and utilized as the basis for recommendations for action and further study. The chapter ends with concluding remarks. First, a review of the research questions indicated that no statistically significant difference was found in the reduction of violence/incidents among inmates who participated in the Alternatives to Violence Project program workshops. The hypothesis that participating in the AVP workshops will not result in a significant reduction of violence/incidents among those inmates was accepted.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if inmates who participated in the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) had a reduction in behavioral misconduct based on archival data (Central Files) contained in the Disciplinary file at California State Prison (CSP) Solano. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine if the level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) in AVP programs indicates differences in misconduct reports.

The Problem

Jenness et al. (2007) commented,

Institutional violence continues to be one of the most significant challenges facing corrections administrators and staff. It poses threats to maintaining order in correctional facilities, ensuring the safety of correctional personnel and inmates, effectively designing and delivering programming that enhances inmates' ability to survive in corrections facilities and prosper once released from such facilities, and otherwise implementing corrections in a way that benefits inmates, correctional personnel, and the citizenry. In short, prison violence is a significant social, administrative, and public safety issue. (p. 7)

California's total state budget for all government services hovers at around \$100 billion per year, and the state is facing a \$41 billion budget shortage. Programs for educating children, providing social services to the elderly, public healthcare, and services to transportation and infrastructure are being slashed. Tax increases are being proposed across the board. More than 100,000 inmates are released each year, and nearly 80,000 of them return to prison. It costs \$47,600 per year to house one inmate, and \$600,000 to build a new prison cell. California's growing prison population exceeds 172,000 inmates (in a system designed to house just 75,000). As it approaches 230% of design capacity, conditions are leading to hostilities and conflict, which then find their way into the state's communities. On average there are more than 315 violent riots each year in California's prisons that are not disclosed to the public (Taxpayers for Improving Public Safety [TiPS], 2012).

As the government and local officials wrestle with prison overcrowding and the rising cost of prison healthcare across this great state of California, violence erupts in the prison systems every day. There is a need for immediate intervention. And, though those advocates for rehabilitation strengthen the incarcerated populations' literacy levels

through education and offer college programs, there is a need to increase programs focusing on reduction in violent behaviors, paradigm shifts of past toxic beliefs, and cognitive behavior reconstruction. The AVP does all three.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if inmates who participated in the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) had a reduction in behavioral misconduct based on archival data (Central Files) contained in the Disciplinary file at California State Prison (CSP) Solano. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine if the level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) in AVP programs indicates differences in misconduct reports.

Research Questions

1. What are the effects (reduced behavioral misconduct incidents of violent behavior) of the AVP program on inmates housed at CSP-Solano based on archival data recorded in Central Files?
2. Does the level of participation in the AVP program (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) make a difference in the effects (reduced incidents of behavioral misconduct or violent behavior) as recorded in archival data in Central Files at CSP-Solano?
3. Is there a reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct (violent behavior) at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who have previously had disciplinary infractions?

4. Is there a difference in reduction of behavioral or misconduct for inmates based on demographic factors of race, age, and education?

Methodology

This study was a causal-comparative ex post facto design that compared the number of infractions reported in the Central Files of participants in the AVP workshops. Data were collected on 195 level II inmates. Quantitative research using data analysis was used to examine the effects of the AVP on inmate behaviors. Data were gathered through information collected from each participant's Central File and attendance statistics retained through the AVP. The AVP files contained the names of participants, their CDCR number, the date the participant attended the workshop, how many workshops were attended, and ethnicity. All of the data gathered were calculated and categorized. The findings were compared to the literature to ascertain those supported by the literature and identify those not found in the literature. Final findings and arguments derived from the data analysis were presented in a narrative and table format.

Population and Sample

CSP-Solano currently houses 4,536 inmates (CDCR, 2012). Between March 2009 and October 2011, a total of 256 inmates participated in the AVP workshops. This study incorporates information from the Central Files of those participants. Data were collected on all 256 participants; however, 29 were paroled during the time of this study and 25 were transferred to other institutions; therefore, the Central File for those inmates was no longer located at CSP-Solano and was not accessible. Additionally, seven Central

Files were not available during the 2-week period information was gleaned, leaving a candidate pool of 195 participants' files available to utilize data for this study.

Of the 195 participants, 107 were African American, representing more than half (55%) of those included in the study, 7% were Hispanic, 27% were White, and 11% were of other races. One participant's ethnicity was undetermined. This study consisted of incarcerated male offenders, ages 18 to 77. The largest group of respondents (46%) was between the ages of 43 and 52. Only a small percentage of the participants (2%) were younger than 33. Of the participants, 168 (86%) were originally incarcerated for violent offenses, and 27 (14%) were arrested for nonviolent offenses. Violent offenses include homicide, robbery, assault and battery, sex offenses, and kidnapping. Educational experiences and levels varied by participant. Just over a third of participants (35%) had their General Education Diploma (GED). About one in four (26%), however, did not have a GED and did not complete high school.

The California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) is a risk prediction tool, which estimates individual parolee risk to re-offend using existing data collected by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, and automated offender "rap sheets" provided to CDCR by the California Department of Justice. Almost all participants obtained a risk assessment of "low" (95%).

Summary of Results: Key Findings and Related Literature

Research Question 1

What are the effects (reduced behavioral misconduct or incidents of violent behavior) of the AVP program on inmates housed at CSP-Solano based on archival data recorded in Central Files?

Finding. No statistically significant differences were found in the reduction of disciplinary infractions among all inmates who participated in the AVP program. These results may stem from the fact that the AVP workshops are attended on a volunteer basis, through a self-selection process; that is, the inmates who are “proactive” in signing up for this workshop have already decided to change their behaviors or their behaviors have not necessarily been problems in the past. Of the 195 participants in this study, only 21 had previous or recent infractions that qualified within the time period studied for this research, thus resulting in the study’s inability to capture the nonprogramming inmates versus those participants with little to no disciplinary infractions. The hypothesis that participating in the AVP workshop will not result in a significant reduction of disciplinary infractions overall among all inmates was accepted.

Related literature. Milkman and Wanberg (2007), in their study for the U.S. Department of Justice, entitled *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment: A Review and Discussion for Corrections Professionals*, listed the following principles for successful CBT treatment:

- Services should be behavioral in nature.
- Interventions should employ cognitive-behavioral social learning techniques such as modeling, role-playing, and cognitive restructuring.

- Reinforcement in the program should be largely positive, not negative.
- Services should be intensive, lasting 3 to 12 months (depending on need) and occupying 40 to 70 percent of the offender's time during the course of the program.
- Treatment interventions should be used primarily with higher risk offenders, targeting their criminogenic (crime-inducing) needs.
- Less-hardened or lower-risk offenders do not require intervention and may be moved toward more criminality by intrusive interventions.
- Conducting interventions in the community as opposed to an institutional setting will increase treatment effectiveness. (pp. xxiv-xxv)

Points 5 and 6 are directly related to the ineffectiveness of targeting a population with “low” proclivity for rule violations.

Although it would seem logical to just “pit” the right inmates in the AVP workshops, to do so would violate the very premise of the “volunteer” program. The study went on to say,

Offenders vary greatly in terms of their motivation to participate in treatment programs. Policymakers and practitioners often feel that providing services to those who want them is money well spent, while forcing services on a resistant group of individuals is a waste of resources. Evidence shows that behavioral change is more likely to occur when an individual has the self-motivation to improve. (p. xxv)

This provides a plausible reason why participants with little to no use of violence or behavior infractions were virtually unaffected by the AVP workshops; they were already displaying positive behavior..

Research Question 2

Does the level of participation in the AVP program (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) make a difference in the effects (reduced incidents of behavioral misconduct or violent behavior) as recorded in archival data in Central Files at CSP-Solano?

Finding. No statistically significant differences were found in the reduction of disciplinary infractions by those who participated in differing numbers of workshops. The participants in this study displayed high levels of self-discipline, good behaviors, and moderate-to-no infractions. The inmates who took Basic went from 19 to 14 infractions. Those who participated in the Advance level workshops increased the number of infractions by four. Those who participated in the Training for Trainers (T4T), the facilitators training workshop, had no infractions period, pre or post. Again, this is a indication to the *type* of inmates who participated in this study. The hypothesis that there is no difference in the reduction of incidents of behavioral misconduct by level of participation (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) was accepted.

Related literature. *A Study of the Effectiveness of An Alternatives to Violence Workshops in A Prison System* (Sloan, 2003) provides insight into the tools AVP teaches the inmates to incorporate into their lives daily. Sloane is attributed to saying, “Another way to perhaps explain how AVP works is through the notion of power (control and influence of one’s life and environment)” (p. 117). AVP is structured around a notion of “transforming power.” The workshops aim specifically to instill the idea that the inmates do have the power, and the ability to control their lives and influence their environments.

This may explain the lack of influence the multiple workshops have on the behaviors of the participants. The AVP workshops have empowered the participants to take control of their environments. If a prisoner is behaving, he should continue to do so.

Research Question 3

Is there a reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct (violent behavior) at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who have previously had disciplinary infractions?

Finding. In answer to Research Question 3, because there was a statistically significant reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct after the workshop among inmates who had disciplinary infractions prior to the workshop (from 32 misconducts preworkshop to 11 postworkshop), this area displayed the largest significant change from pre- to postworkshop attended. Because the majority of the population captured in the study had no disciplinary infractions prior to taking the AVP workshops, the researcher decided to look only at the participants who did. As a result, significant change was captured in the reduction of infractions; the hypothesis that participating in the AVP program results in no reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct for those who previously had disciplinary infractions was rejected.

Related literature. Farrell (2011) wrote,

The harsh reality of prison life is a difficult prospect for many inmates to accept, often having a detrimental impact on confidence and self-esteem (Tittle, 1972). In many instances it acts as a criminogenic agent and can increase the likelihood of recidivism (Haney, 2006). The difficulty of adapting to prison life is often evidenced by institutional infractions, which is congruent with the adaption of the prison subculture and the rejection of previous norms (Gellespie, 2003). Toch (1977) believes to mitigate the negativity of the prison environment, several environmental factors must be addressed. They are privacy, safety, structure, support, emotional feedback, social stimulation, activity, and freedom. The AVP workshops provide the participants with avenues via learning skills to begin the process in navigating through the negativity of the prison environment and begin to obtain social stimulation and other positive traits that reduce violence and inappropriate behaviors while incarcerated. A noteworthy evidence of this change was within the 21 participants who previously had incidents of

misbehavior and infractions but after taking the AVP workshops infractions and misbehaviors improved significantly. (p. 1)

Research Question 4

Is there a difference in reduction of behavioral misconduct or violent behavior for inmates based on demographic factors of race, age, and education?

There were no statistically significant differences in the reduction of behavioral misconduct based on the demographic factors of race and age. Among inmates who are college graduates, however, there was a reduction of behavioral misconduct as a result of participation in the AVP workshop. Education played a significant factor in those inmates who previously participated in behaviors that led to disciplinary write-ups. This group made a noticeable reduction in negative behaviors.

Part of the null hypothesis was accepted as it relates to age and race and part of the null hypothesis (referring specifically to education levels) was rejected as it pertains to college graduates and reductions in misconduct among this population studied. Those participants between the ages of 20-29, 30-39, and 50-59 all showed reductions in infractions.

Related literature. Empirical evidence by researchers reveals that education is the key to reduction of recidivism and reduction of violence. Tilston (2011) wrote,

Education provides social and economic opportunities for those who choose to embrace these resources and has also been named as the most effective solution for curbing violence. This is not only true in outside communities, but has also been shown to be beneficial to those behind bars. (pp. 61-62)

Conclusions

Conclusion 1

Based on the findings of this study it is concluded that participation in the AVP workshops while not showing a reduction in incidents of behavioral misconduct has a positive impact on attitude and prepares inmates for better interaction with others. In an article written by John Wilkins published in the *Howard Journal*, Wilkins writes, “Offenders whose attitudes changed pro-socially were more likely to be reconvicted than were offenders whose attitudes did not change positively” (p. 81). Participation in cognitive behavior programs is a catalyst to changing an inmate’s behavior, providing coping tools to assist with incarceration and creating paradigm shifts.

Conclusion 2

Based on the findings, it was determined that the level of participation in the AVP program (Basic, Advanced, and T4T) does not make a difference in the effects (reduced incidents of behavioral misconduct or violent behavior) as recorded in archival data in Central Files at CSP-Solano. But what the data did reveal and what was interesting to the researcher is that of the 195 participants who were included in this study, 183 participated in both Basic and Advanced. That is a 93% return rate for a program in which participation is on a *volunteer basis*. What these data also reveal is that a majority of the participants feel this program must be effective, as they would not have signed up for the second level. Currently, the second level has a waiting list of 326 and the third level 221. The third level T4T is Facilitators Training, though statistically the results or affects of the AVP program were not captured, theoretically, the popularity of this program and the

steady stream of requests to take the AVP workshops led this researcher to believe that the AVP workshops have been effective to inmates housed at CSP-Solano.

Conclusion 3

Based on the findings, it was determined that there was a reduction of inmate behavioral misconduct or violent behavior at CSP-Solano for inmates participating in the AVP program who have previously had disciplinary infractions. Because this study did not filter out participants who had previous infractions versus those who programmed positively, the participants in this study were high programmers—174 to be exact. These inmates either had previous infractions outside the time period being studied or none at all. This left a pool of 21, a little over 10% and there was a significant reduction of behavior misconduct and infractions among this targeted group. This researcher believes that had the population being studied focused only on participants with infractions during the time span covered by this research there would have been an even greater statistical behavior change noted.

Conclusion 4

Based on statistical data, it was determined that the only change noted was in the *education* demographics. There was a significant reduction of inmate infractions based on education. It can be concluded that it is possible for education to become a focal point in the reduction of violence, behavioral changes, and possibly recidivism among inmates and education is a significant factor in the reduction of violence among the incarcerated population.

Conclusion 5

Based on statistical data and this researcher's findings, it was determined that this study was unable to capture the participants' views, beliefs, and feelings about the AVP workshops. Causality cannot be concluded from this study because qualitative measures that would determine cause and effect were not utilized. Experimentation utilizing the prison population is closely scrutinized and would require extensive investigation by the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects. This researcher took into account the time limit available and the complexities with doing a cause-and-effect methodology study that would include speaking with prisoners; interviews, and surveys would not allow enough time to complete this study.

Conclusion 6

The statistical data concluded that most hypotheses were not supported by the data (two were). However, the significance of the continuation of research regarding the effectiveness of the AVP is important. What this study did was raise questions for future research and allow for further examination of this topic. The number of men waiting to take the next Basic class—326 cannot all be wrong.

Implications for Actions

1. It is recommended that all 33 prisons in California be required to provide AVP workshops to all prisoners who volunteer to participate. Further, it is recommended that resources be allocated to train and support counselors who work with the AVP

program. The number of prisons currently participating in AVP workshops will be increased from to 33.

2. It is recommended that funding be allocated for an increase of self-help programs and behavior modification programs throughout all 33 institutions in the CDCR system.
3. Based on the study results, inmates with “high” CSRA scores are mandated to attend behavior modification programs upon entry into the penal system.
4. Based on the findings and conclusions of this study concerning the reduction in violence for those with advanced educational degrees, it is recommended that each prison expand the educational system available to inmates and require that every inmate be enrolled in a GED program leading to a college degree program. Special attention must be given to the adult learning styles and the application of new knowledge and skills to work opportunities when released from prison.
5. Inmates reading below 6.0 grade point level will be assigned to the education program.
6. Inmates attending school full time will participate in behavioral modification programs.
7. Inmates with high CSRA scores will be mandated to participate in behavioral modification programming.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. It is recommended that funding for further research be allocated utilizing a replica of this study using a longer span of time. This study captured 18 months of incarceration periods and workshop participation. Add an additional longitudinal study for the same

population as studied in this research going out 3 years, 5 years etc., to see if “time” produces different results.

2. Conduct a qualitative study that includes interviewing. Add interviews and personal testimonies to this study, self-reporting (i.e., responses to surveys) from incarcerated participants, staff, and inmate facilitators. This is a way to capture perceptions and beliefs regarding violence reduction. Data can be gathered from databases and Central Files, but archival sources cannot capture perceptions and attitudes. This, coupled with data, makes a richer study.
3. Further study is needed to determine if there are significant statistical differences based on race.
4. Further study is needed to determine if there are significant statistical differences among participants with low education levels.
5. Replicate this study using incarcerated women. There is a limited amount of research on this population, and the findings could support identifying methods to reduce violence among the female incarcerated population.
6. Conduct a comparison study utilizing one prison, with two separate yards. Administer AVP on one yard while withholding AVP at the other. It is difficult to ascertain the determining factor that causes the change or decline in violence without another group with which to compare it. Study the same institution using separate yards; instituting AVP on one yard while comparing that yard with another yard that does not have the program will reduce outside factors that utilizing separate institutions may create.

7. AVP is currently used in 18 California institutions. Look at those institutions, and compare levels of violence with those institutions that do not offer AVP. This kind of research will allow the researcher to examine the effect AVP has on the prison as a whole.

Concluding Remarks

In today's society, it is easy to say lock up the criminals—the drug dealers, rapists, and murders—then throw away the key! Joe Citizen could clean his hands and consider this a job “well done.” But . . . is it? With the penal system's jails running over and the prisons overcrowded, at what point do we say, Stop! Enough! Let us not keep punishing the inmate who was once a 19-year-old and is now 45 and hope the lesson sticks. During his jail span, he has had to fight, push, kick, and, in some cases, kill for a place among his fellow prisoners. At no time was this prisoner taught the skills to cope with long-term incarceration. At no time was he taught about family separation anxiety, or how to deal with his repressed anger, or with losing contact with everyone in his family, which is what happens statistically around 7 years of incarceration. Twenty-five years later the prison system continues to punish him and hope he understands what he is being punished for. The AVP program closes those gaps. It is a program that steps in and teaches the incarcerated population ways to articulate, control, and identify feelings of separation, injustice, and anger. It also focuses on forgiveness and owning up to one's past behaviors. These are lessons incarceration fails to teach, being in the classroom bypasses, and society refuses to hear.

The purpose of this study was to determine if AVP is impacting inmates and empowering them with coping skills and tools to combat and traverse life in prison. While statistically this study may appear to raise more questions than it set out to answer, it will be a very good barometer to use when selecting the next group of inmates or AVP participants to study for further research. This study provides information to the readers that the change in behavior and the potential for reduction of violence in society must begin while the prisoner is incarcerated.

Researcher's Lessons From This Study

What I learned by doing this research is that the population that needs to be studied is those inmates who have a propensity for violence—the ones who are already displaying inappropriate behaviors and have been written up for such behaviors. CDCR has a system in place to categorize these particular inmates. The California Static Risk Assessment scores could be used as criteria for further research and to ensure that the “right” population is studied to obtain an accurate cause of the effects of the AVP program. The participants in this study had predominantly “low” CSRA scores (95%); there was only one participant in this study with a high, and 9 were moderate. This study did not capture the population labeled as “high” or violent. While this was a surprise to the researcher, it makes sense in the end that those inmates who were not violent or those who misbehaved from the beginning of the study remained that way by the end. Those who had displayed infractions of behavior had a change after taking the workshops.

Perhaps it is being African American; this caused the large draw of African American inmates to enroll in the program (55%); therefore, in future studies I would use several other “faces” to represent the program as to attract a more *diverse* population.

The most important lesson I have learned is that no data or statistic can measure the amount of “thank you’s,” and “I appreciate you” from the participants for overseeing this program that I have received in the history of my career at CDCR. I am constantly bombarded with requests from inmates to be added to the waiting list or to be put in the next workshop. I have never had as many phone calls from counselors, correctional staff, or educators commenting on a visible change in an inmate who has taken this workshop. And . . . I have never before in my career received outside calls from family members who took the AVP workshop on the “streets” wanting to thank me for offering it on the “inside” because now they are communicating better with their spouse, or they now have a better understanding of their son’s pain or the struggles their father has faced. And most of all, they have learned to forgive. None of this, none of what I have experienced, of what I felt receiving those phone calls or reading a card can be captured in a research study, in statistical reports, or in a file. It is the type of results that will stay imbedded in me forever and that have provided me with the motivation to continue believing this program does make a difference and people do change.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Alcoholics Anonymous. (2012). *Information on AA*. Alcoholics Anonymous World Services. Retrieved from <http://www.aa.org/lang/en/subpage.cfm>
- Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Allan, R. (2005). *Getting control of your anger*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Almond, L. (2008). *School violence*. Detroit, MI: Greenhaven Press.
- Anderson, C. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). The effects of media violence on society. *Science*, 295, 2377-2378.
- Anderson, K. (1995). *Violence in society*. Probe Ministries. Retrieved from <http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/violence.html>
- AVP International. (1999). *Alternatives to violence project/USA*. St. Paul, MN. Retrieved from <http://avpinternational.org/>
- Banuelos, S. D. (2008). *Prison rape: A description of the problem*. A project report presented to the Department of Criminal Justice, California State University, Long Beach .
- Beck, A. J., & Harrison, P. M. (2010, August 26). *Sexual victimization in prisons and jails reported by inmates 2008-09*. Retrieved from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2202>
- Behavior modification. (2011). In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse>
- Bell, A. (2004). *The “discovery” of the violent woman in prison: A descriptive analysis of violent incidents in the Canadian federal correctional system* (Master's Thesis, University of Ottawa, Criminology). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. MR01414)
- Betts, R. D. (2009). *A question of freedom*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Bishchoff, M. (2003). *How restorative is AVP?: Evaluating the alternatives to violence project according to the restorative justice yard stick*. St. Paul, MN: AVP.

- Bryman, A. (1992). *Quantitative and qualitative research: Further reflections on their integration*. In D. J. Brannen (Ed.), *Mixing methods: Qualitative and quantitative research* (pp. 57-78). Aldershot, UK: Avebury.
- Bryan, T. G. (2002). Self-view and violence in prison. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(03), 1556B. (UMI No. 3046353)
- Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2002, December). Violent video games and hostile expectations: A test of the general aggression model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(1), 1679-1686. doi: 10.1177/014616702237649
- Byrne, J. M., & Hummer, D. (2007, February). Myths and realities of prison violence: A review of the evidence. *Victims and Offenders*, 2(1), 77-90.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2007, September). *Inmate incidents in institutions: Calendar year 2006*. Data Analysis Unit, Offender Information Services Branch, Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/reports_research/offender_information_services_branch/Annual/BEH1/BEH1d2006.pdf
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2009a, April). *One and two year follow-up recidivism rates*. Adult Research Branch. Retrieved from http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/Offender_Information_Services_Branch/Annual/RECID2/RECID2d2006.pdf
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2009b, May 26). *Gov. Schwarzenegger to reveal deeper budget cuts*. Retrieved from <http://www.kpbs.org/news/2009/may/26/gov-schwarzenegger-reveal-deeper-budget-cuts/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2010, November 17). *Corrections: Year at a glance*. Retrieved from http://www.CDCR.ca.gov/News/docs/CDCR_year_at_a_glance2010.pdf
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2011, June 7). *State responds to three-judge court's order requiring a reduction in prison crowding*. Retrieved from <http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/news/docs/6.7.11-Response-to-1.12.10-Order.pdf>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2012, February 27). *Weekly report of population*. Data Analysis Unit: Offender Information Services Branch, Sacramento. Retrieved from <http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/>
- Carter, D. L. (2007). *Getting the best of your anger*. Grand Rapids, MI: Revell.
- Castillo, J. J. (2009). *Research population*. Retrieved from <http://www.experiment-resources.com/research-population.html>

- CDCR COMPSTAT. (2012, March 12). *Division of Adult Institutions (DAI): 13 month statistical reports*. Retrieved from <http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/COMPSTAT/DAI-Reports.html>
- Chappell, C. A. (2003). *Post-secondary correctional education and recidivism: A meta-analysis of research conducted 1990-1999* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3093357)
- Cordon, I. M., & Segovia, D. A. (2008). *Alternatives to violence project: A review of the research literature*. Literature Review, University of California-Davis, Center for Public Policy Research, Davis.
- Cramer, D., & Howitt, D. (2004). *The Sage dictionary of statistics: A practical resource for students in the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- CTB/McGraw-Hill. (2000). Frequently asked questions about the T.A.B.E. Test. Monterey, CA. Retrieved from <http://www.sabes.org/assessment/tabe-faq.pdf>
- Cuizon, G. (n.d.). Education in prison: Benefits of inmate education program. *Educational Issues @ Suite 101*. Retrieved from <http://gwendolyncuizon.suite101.com/education-in-prison-a94395>
- Curren, M. (1994). *The alternatives to violence project: An evaluation of a programme at Auckland Prison East Division*. Auckland, New Zealand: Program Evaluation, Department of Justice.
- Davis, K. R. (2010). *The effectiveness of a batterer intervention program: A case study* (Master's Thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1476670)
- DeFoore, W. G. (2004). *Anger: Deal with it, heal with it, stop it from killing you*. Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications.
- DiCamillo, M., & Field, M. (2004). *Proposition 66 field poll survey*. The independent and non-partisan survey of public opinion. San Francisco, CA: Field Research Corporation.

- Farrell, S. (2011). *The effects of prison programs on prisoner adjustment* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1489304)
- French, S. A., & Gendreau, P. (2006). Reducing prison misconducts: What works! *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33, 185-218.
- Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D. A. (1990). Tertiary prevention: What the meta-analysis of the offender treatment tells us about "what works." *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 32, 173-184.
- George, B. (2007). Empowering people to lead. In B. George (Ed.), *True north* (pp. 179-180). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gilger, C. G. (2007). *Cell dogs: No effect of dog training programs on prioner's self-efficacy* (Master's thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1451051)
- Good, P. I., & Hardin, J. W. (2009). *Common errors in statistics (how to avoid them)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Granoff, G. (2005, May). Prison college programs unlock the keys to human potential. *Education Update Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationupdate.com/archives/2005/May/html/FEAT-BehindBars.html>
- Hallinan, J. T. (2001). *Going up the river* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Random House.
- Hansen, C. (2008). Cognitive-behavioral interventions: Where they come from and what they do. *Federal Probation*, 72(2), 43-49.
- Harper, M. D. (1995, May). *Prison education program participation and recidivism: A test of the normalization hypothesis*. Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation. Retrieved from http://www.bop.gov/news/research_projects/published_reports/recidivism/orepredprg.pdf
- Harvey, P. (2011, April 5). *Fact File: 10 facts on injuries & violence*. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/features/factfiles/injuries/facts/en/index1.html>
- Hatch, J. (2002). *Doing qualitative reseach in educational settings*. Albany, NY: New York Press.
- Haugen, H. M. (2004). *Violent children*. Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press.
- The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. (2003, Spring). Key facts: TV violence, 3335, pp. 1-4. Retrieved from <http://www.kff.org/entmedia/upload/key-facts-tv-violence.pdf>

- Herek, P. D. (2008). *A brief introduction to sampling*. Retrieved March 11, 2012, from <http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/index.html>
- Hughes, B. W. Jr. (2011, June 22). Public forum/state of reentry. *Malibu Times*. Retrieved from <http://malibutimes.net/articles/2011/06/27/opinion/opinion/opinion1.txt>
- Jarvis-Durham, L. D. (2006). *The incarceration of African-American males: A look at criminal rehabilitative services at the county level*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3215975)
- Jenko, F. L. (2010). *The social injustice of prison rape: A historical analysis* (Master's thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1490295)
- Jenness, V., Maxson, C. L., Matsuda, K. N., & Sumner, J. M. (2007, May 16). *Violence in California correctional facilities: An empirical examination of sexual assault*. Irvine, CA: Center for Evidence-Based Corrections, University of California. Retrieved from http://ucicorrections.seweb.uci.edu/pdf/PREA_Presentation_PREA_Report_UCI_Jenness_et_al.pdf
- Komarovskaya, I. (2009). *Trauma, PTSD, and the Cycle of Violence Among Incarcerated Men and Women*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3362846)
- Laci, M. (2004). *Prisons and jails*. Wylie, TX: Information Plus.
- Lahm, K. F. (2001). *Prison violence: A multilevel examination of the importation and deprivation theories*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3028028)
- Lewis-Beck, M. S., Bryman, A., & Liao, T. F. (Eds.). (2004). *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Retrieved from <http://0-srmo.sagepub.com.leopac.ulv.edu/view/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-social-science-research-methods/n20.xml>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Logan-Ellis, A. R. (2010). *The board: Effective multi-theoretical model for treatment of the substance-abusing offender*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1489935)
- Maggioncalda, E. (2007). *Inmate motivations to participate in prison programs: Are they related to actual participation*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3247509)

- Maxfield, M. G., & Widom, C. S. (1996). The cycle of violence: Re-visited six years later. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 150, 390-395. Retrieved from <http://archpedi.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/abstract/150/4/390>
- Mazza, G. J. (2012). *Report on sexual victimization in prisons and jails*. Review Panel on Prison Rape. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/reviewpanel/pdfs/prea_finalreport_2012.pdf
- Mazzocchi, M. (2008). *Statistics for marketing and consumer research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Milkman, H. B., & Wanberg, K. W. (2005). *Criminal conduct and substance abuse treatment for adolescents: Pathways to self-discovery and change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Milkman, H. B., & Wanberg, K. W. (2007, May). *Cognitive-behavioral treatment: A review and discussion for corrections professionals* (NCI Accession No. 021657). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. Retrieved from <http://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/corrections/documents/cognitiveBehavioral.pdf>; available from <http://nicic.gov/Library/021657>
- Mitchell, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (2010). *Research design: Explained*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Morrison, K., Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (2000). *Research methods of education*. London, England: Routledge Falmer.
- Neuman, L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Noble, R. (2003). *Race matters: Black rage in the American prison system* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3085785)
- Nolan, P. (2009, August 21). *The truth behind prison violence*. Prison Fellowship. Retrieved from <http://www.justicefellowship.org>
- Noll, D. (2011, November 20). *Building a new identity: Race, gangs, and violence in California prisons*. Retrieved http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract_id=2015679
- Parenti, C. (2008). *Lockdown America*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.

- Parks, P. J. (2008). *School violence: Current issues*. San Diego, CA: Reference Point Press.
- Petersilia, J. (2007, December). *Meeting the challenges of rehabilitation in California's prison and parole system*. Retrieved from http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/news/docs/GovRehabilitationStrikeTeamRpt_012308.pdf
- Potter-Efron, R. T. (2004). *Angry all the time: An emergency guide to anger control*. Oakland, CA: New Harbinger.
- Rocheleau, A. M. (2011). *Prisoner's coping skills and involment in serious prison misconduct and violence* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3450586)
- Sabol, W. J., & West, H. C. (2010, December 21). *Prisoners in 2009* (Rev. ed.). U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2232>
- Salkind, N. (2003). *Exploring research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education/Merrill Prentice-Hall.
- Santos, M. G. (2006). *Inside life behind bars in America*. New York, NY: St Martin's Press.
- Schwarzenegger, A. (2010, January 8). *Gov. Schwarzenegger proposes budget, calls special session to address immediate current year shortfall*. Retrieved from <http://www.scpr.org/news/2010/01/08/10282/california-state-budget-released/>
- Schwartz, S., & Boodell, D. (2009). *Dreams from the monster factory*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Simmons, R. (2002). *Odd girl out*. New York, NY: Harcourt.
- Sloane, S. D. (2003). *A study of the effectiveness of an alternatives to violence workshops in a prison system*. St. Paul, MN: AVP.
- Sproull, N. L. (2002). *Handbook of research methods: A guide for practitioners and students in social sciences* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Stern, P. C. (2011). *An evaluation of a cognitive behavioral group program for offenders in a medium security prison setting: Thinking for change* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3455205)
- Steurer, S., & Smith, L. G. (2003). *Education reduces crime: Three-state recidivism study executive summary*. Centerville, UT: MTC Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.ceanational.org/PDFs/EdReducesCrime.pdf>

- Steurer, S. J., Smith, L., & Tracy, A. (2001, September). *OCE/CEA three state recidivism study*. Lanham, MD: Correctional Education Association. Retrieved from <http://www.ceanational.org/PDFs/3StateFinal.pdf>
- Steyer, J. P. (2002). *The other parent*. New York, NY: Atria Books.
- Stiglitz, J. E., & Bilmes, L. J. (2008a). *The three trillion dollar war: The true cost of the Iraq conflict*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Stiglitz, J. E., & Bilmes, L. J. (2008b, April). *The 3 trillion dollar war*. Retrieved from <http://www.vanityfair.com/politics/features/2008/04/stiglitz200804?currentPage=all>
- Straker, D. (2002, September 30). *Changing minds: In detail*. Retrieved from <http://syque.com/bookstore/changingminds.htm>
- Straker, D. M. (2008, May 18). Convenience sampling. Retrieved from http://changingminds.org/explanations/research/sampling/convenience_sampling.htm
- Suvanjieff, I., & Engle, D. G. (2008). *Peacejam: A billion simple acts of peace*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Tabor, M. B. W. (1991, October 3). Judge finds bias against minority inmates. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/10/03/nyregion/judge-finds-bias-against-minority-inmates.html>
- Taxpayers for Improving Public Safety (TIPS). (2012). Website. Retrieved from http://www.forpublicsafety.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=358&Itemid=65
- Tilston. (2011). *Where is the rehab?: Evaluating the successes and failure of the U.S. system of punishment by assessing the contribution of nonviolence education in supporting authentic rehabilitating among inmates* (Master's Thesis)
- Toch, H., Adams, K., & Grant, D. (1989). *Coping: Maladaptation in prisons*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2010, August). *Rape and sexual assault*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=317>
- Vaknin, S. (2007). *Malignant self-love: Narcissism revisited* (8th ed.). L. Rangelovska (Ed.). Prague, Czech Republic: Narcissus.

- Violence. (2012). *Human Diseases and Conditions*. Retrieved from <http://www.humanillnesses.com/Behavioral-Health-Sel-Vi/Violence.html>
- Walrath, C. (2001). Evaluation of an inmate-run Alternatives to Violence project: The impact of inmate to inmate intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 697-711. Retrieved from <http://jiv.sagepub.com/content/16/7/697.short>
- Warren, J. (2008). *One in 100*. Washington, DC: The Pew Center on the States. Retrieved from http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/8015PCTS_Prison08_FINAL_2-1-1_FORWEB.pdf
- Widom, C. S. (1989). Child abuse, neglect, and adult behavior: Research design and findings on criminality, violence, and child abuse. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 59, 355-367. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.1989.tb01671.x
- Widom, C. S., & Maxfield, M. G. (2001, February). *National Institute of Justice research in brief: An update on the "cycle of violence."* U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij>
- Wilkinson, J. (2005). Evaluating evidence for the effectiveness of the reasoning and rehabilitation programme. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44, 70-85. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2311.2005.00356.x
- Wiloch, T. (2004). *Prison and jails: A deterrent to crime? (Information plus reference: Prisons & jail)*. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale and Design and Thomson Learning.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
AVP DATA WORKSHEET

AVP Participation Data Worksheet

Computer Generated Number

CDC

Date of Incarceration (initial)

Penal Code _____

☐ Violent

☐ I don't know

☐ Non-Violent

☐ Other _____

Last Name, First (please print)

Birthday

Ethnicity

☐ African-American

☐ White

☐ Hispanic

☐ Other

Education Experience

☐ High School Graduate

☐ GED

☐ College Graduate

☐ Did not graduate HS/no GED

☐ Other

Scores

☐ T.A.B.E. Reading Level _____

☐ CSRA Score _____

AVP Experience

☐ Basic Date _____

☐ Advance Date _____

☐ T4T Date _____

Write-Ups (One year after Basic AVP Workshop)

☐ 128 Date _____

☐ 115 Admin Date _____

☐ 115 Serious (A, B, C, D, F) Date _____

☐ Other Date _____

Date Information Recorded

 / / 

MM

DD

YYYY